

Attachment E  
Planning Commission Resolution  
No. 12-019A

Pebble Beach Company  
PLN100138

Board of Supervisors  
June 19, 2012



**Before the Planning Commission in and for the  
County of Monterey, State of California**

In the matter of the application of:

**Pebble Beach Company (PLN100138)**

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-019A**

Resolution by the Monterey County Planning  
Commission:

- 1) Considering the draft Environmental Impact Report with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan;
- 2) Recommending that the Board of Supervisors certify the EIR based on the findings and evidence;
- 3) Recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan; and
- 4) Recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

[PLN100138, Pebble Beach Company, Pebble Beach (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 007-091-028-000, 007-091-033-000, 007-101-041-000, 007-991-001-000, 008-021-009-000, 008-022-024-000, 008-022-031-000, 008-022-032-000, 008-022-035-000, 008-031-014-000, 008-031-015-000, 008-031-019-000, 008-032-004-000, 008-032-005-000, 008-032-006-000, 008-034-001-000, 008-041-009-000, 008-163-001-000, 008-163-003-000, 008-163-005-000, 008-164-001-000, 008-165-001-000, 008-171-009-000, 008-171-022-000, 008-241-008-000, 008-242-007-000, 008-272-010-000, 008-272-011-000, 008-311-011-000, 008-312-002-000, 008-313-002-000, 008-313-003-000, 008-321-006-000, 008-321-007-000, 008-321-008-000, 008-321-009-000, 008-423-002-000, 008-423-019-000, 008-423-029-000, 008-423-030-000, 008-431-009-000, 008-561-020-000, and 008-991-001-000)], Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan and the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone.

**The Pebble Beach Company application (PLN100138) came on for public hearing before the Monterey County Planning Commission on May 30, 2012. Having considered all the written and documentary evidence, the administrative record, the staff report, oral testimony, and other evidence presented, the Planning Commission recommends as follows:**

**FINDINGS**  
**FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATION OF EIR AND ADOPTION OF OVERRIDING**  
**CONSIDERATIONS**

1. **FINDING:** **CEQA (EIR)** - Per CEQA Statute section 15090(a)(1), (2), and (3), the final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; the final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission of the County of Monterey, and that the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to recommending approval of the project; and the final EIR reflects the County of Monterey's independent judgment and analysis.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The proposed project (PLN100138) consists of Combined Development Permits (CDPs) to allow the phased development and preservation of the remaining undeveloped Pebble Beach Company properties located within the Del Monte Forest. The project would allow the subdivision of up to 10 sites, resulting in the creation of 90 to 100 single-family residential lots, the renovation and expansion of visitor serving uses, and the preservation of approximately 635 acres as forested open space. The project also proposes lot line adjustments and lot mergers, development on slope exceeding 30%, development within 100 feet of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA), tree removal, and development within a public viewshed.
  - b) The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires preparation of an environmental impact report if there is substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.
  - c) The draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for Pebble Beach Company application (PLN100138) was prepared in accordance with CEQA and circulated for public review from November 14, 2011 through January 9, 2012 (SCH#: 2011041028).
  - d) Issues that were analyzed in the draft EIR include Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Climate Change, Cultural Resources, Geology, Seismicity & Soils, Hydrology & Water Quality, Land Use & Recreation, Noise & Vibration, Transportation & Circulation, Public Services & Utilities, and Water Supply & Demand. The DEIR identified potential significant impacts that are either less than significant or can be mitigated to less than significant levels on Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Climate Change, Cultural Resources, Geology, Seismicity & Soils, Hydrology & Water Quality, Land Use & Recreation, Noise & Vibration, Transportation & Circulation, and Public Services & Utilities. The DEIR identified significant impacts on Air Quality, Transportation & Circulation, and Water Supply & Demand that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.
  - e) The County prepared "Comments, Responses to Comments, and Revisions to the Draft EIR" for the Pebble Beach Company Project. The Responses to Comments respond to comments that were received during the draft EIR circulation period. The Responses to Comments document was released to the public on April 3, 2012 and responds to all significant environmental points raised by persons and organizations that commented on the DEIR. Together, the DEIR, the revisions to the DEIR, the comments of persons and organizations commenting on the DEIR and a list of all such persons

and organizations, the responses to the comments, and other information added by the County constitute the final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) on the project.

- f) On April 9, 2012, the Subdivision Committee held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the project. On May 30, 2012, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the project.
- g) The Monterey County Planning Department, located at 168 W. Alisal, Second Floor, Salinas, California, 93901, is the custodian of documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the decision to certify the EIR is based.

2. **FINDING:** **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT** – The Project consists of separate project components which are analyzed in the EIR. These components consist of: (1) Improvements to The Lodge at Pebble Beach; (2) Improvements to The Inn at Spanish Bay; (3) Improvements to Collins Field, the Equestrian Center, and the Special Events Area; (4) in Area M, construction of a 100 unit hotel with associated facilities and a spa or, alternatively, a 10 lot residential subdivision; (5) 9 residential subdivisions; (6) Roadway Improvements; (7) Trail Improvements and (8) Infrastructure Improvements. Each of these components has distinct environmental impacts with distinct mitigation measures, although many components have the same environmental impacts and mitigation measures in certain environmental areas of analysis. Attachment 1 [Table ES-3 from the DEIR including the FEIR revisions] lists and summarizes the environmental impacts and mitigation measures that apply to each component. The potential significant effects of the Project are described in Attachment 1 and the findings with respect to them are set forth below.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) See Findings 3 and 4.
  - b) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for the proposed development found in Project File PLN100138.
  - c) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.
  - d) Table ES-3 from the draft EIR and as revised in the final EIR.

3. **FINDING:** **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR THAT ARE REDUCED TO A LEVEL OF “LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT” BY THE MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR AND ADOPTED FOR THE PROJECT** – Per CEQA Statute section 21081(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The EIR identified potentially significant impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Climate Change, Cultural Resources, Geology, Seismicity & Soils, Hydrology & Water Quality, Land Use & Recreation, Noise & Vibration, Transportation & Circulation, and Public Services & Utilities which could result from all components of project. These impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level due to incorporation of mitigation measures from the EIR into the conditions of project approval.
  - b) Aesthetics. Potentially significant impacts on aesthetics have been mitigated to less than significant levels through mitigation measures that

incorporate design features, landscaping requirements, and light & glare reduction measures in design plans for all development sites that involve construction of new visitor-serving structures or modification of existing visitor-serving structures and preparation of landscape plans for the SR1/SR 68/17-Mile Drive intersection. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: AES-A1, AES-A2, and AES-C1. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure AES-A1 has been revised to include the selection of exterior paint colors, which are consistent with the visual character of existing visitor-serving buildings located on the site. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment because the careful selection of paint color helps to ensure building aesthetics fit within the local color palette and does not result in any secondary effects on the environment. See Section 3.1 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.

- c) Air Quality. Potentially significant air quality impacts to sensitive receptors from exposure to objectionable odors from the Equestrian Center have been mitigated to a less than significant level through a mitigation measure that requires the preparation and implementation of a manure management plan. Additional potentially significant impacts to air quality that are significant and unavoidable that would not be mitigated to a less than significant level are discussed in Finding 4. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: AQ-C1, AQ-C2, AQ-D1, and AQ-E1. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure AQ-C2 has been revised to include the installation of Level 3 diesel particulate filters (DPFs) capable of achieving an 85% reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust emissions. Mitigation Measure AQ-D1 has been deleted and text has been added to AQ-C2. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment because the changes only consolidated the mitigation requirements into a single measure without any removal of mitigation requirements. See Section 3.2 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.
- d) Biological Resources. Potentially significant impacts on biological resources have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require development and implementation of site-specific resource management plans for each preservation area; dedication of conservation easements to the Del Monte Forest Foundation; dedication of additional area of undeveloped Monterey pine forest; avoidance of or compensation for the loss of wetlands; maintenance and enhancement of Yadon's piperia, Gowen cypress, Pacific Grove clover and Hickman's potentilla habitats; minimization of habitat disturbance during trail construction; pre-construction surveys for pine rose, California red-legged frog (CRLF), raptors, legless lizard, and Dusky-footed woodrats; design of new red-legged frog breeding habitat; retention of dead trees or snags as bat roosting habitat; and protection of retained trees from construction disturbance. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: BIO-A1, BIO-A2, BIO-B1(C)<sup>1</sup>, BIO-B2, BIO-B3, BIO-C1, BIO-D1 to D7, BIO-E1, BIO-E2, BIO-E5 to E7, BIO-G1, BIO-I1, BIO-J1, and BIO-J2. Additional

---

<sup>1</sup> The (C) at the end of the mitigation measure refers to a mitigation measure that addresses a significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measures that minimize impacts to wetlands and special status species include HYD-A1, HYD-A2, HYD-C1 to C3, GSS-C1, and GSS-D1. See Evidence g) and h) in this Finding. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure BIO-A1 has been revised to include a prohibition of the use of invasive non-native species for landscaping in any project locations adjacent to preservation areas; to provide education on invasive non-native species to residents; and to require outside lighting in the Area B Employee Parking Lot to be directed downward and inward away from the adjacent preservation area. BIO-E1 has been revised to clarify that red-legged frog preconstruction survey areas be determined by a biologist and that exclusion fencing be provided in the Equestrian Center work area. BIO-E2 has been modified to include creation of red-legged frog breeding ponds in the Seal Rock Watershed. BIO-I2 has been revised to clarify the dates of the raptor breeding season. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment for the following reasons: BIO-A1 will provide for increased protection of preservation areas from non-native species; BIO-E1 will ensure that preconstruction clearance surveys and red-legged frog protections will be applied at the Equestrian Center; BIO-E2 will still require red-legged frog breeding pond creation but will allow flexibility in location as long as the new ponds are within the Seal Rock Watershed which is the center of red-legged frog population in the Del Monte Forest; and BIO-I2 has only been clarified in regard to the dates for the application of breeding season requirements. See Section 3.3 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.

- e) Climate Change. Potentially significant impacts to climate change have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require implementation of best management practices for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction; a reduction of annual GHG emissions by 24% relative to business as usual; and validation of GHG emission offset value of preserving Monterey pine forest designated for development. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: CC-A1, CC-A2-A, and CC-A2-B. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure CC-A2-A has been revised to clarify that the project shall reduce annual greenhouse gas emissions by 24% relative to business as usual; to require the mitigation for the one-time emissions associated with tree removal and loss of associated carbon stock; to clarify the provisions required in the GHG Reduction Plan; and to clarify the operational GHG emissions reductions for project Options 1 and 2. CC-A2-B has been revised to clarify the GHG significance threshold of 24%; and to clarify the potential mitigated GHG emissions assuming 100 percent validation of forest preservation offset credit for preserved forest. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment because the revised mitigation measures still require reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in parallel to that necessary in the County overall consistent with AB 32. Mitigation for one-time losses has been clarified to ensure that such mitigation is provided. Other clarifications have been provided to ensure that mitigation overall results in the reductions necessary to meet the required performance standard without decreasing any effectiveness. See Section 3.4 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the

- Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.
- f) Cultural Resources. Potentially significant impacts to cultural resources have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require training for construction workers prior to ground disturbance activities and stopping work if buried cultural deposits, human remains, or vertebrate fossils are encountered during ground disturbance activities. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: CR-B1, CR-B2, and CR-D1. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure CR-B1 has been revised to clarify that training is required for construction personnel involved in grading and other ground-disturbing activities. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment because the revisions only clarify that training applies specifically to the construction workers involved in work that could affect cultural resources (and not to workers not involved in such work). See Section 3.5 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.
- g) Geology, Seismicity, & Soils. Potentially significant impacts to geology, seismicity, and soils have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require inclusion of recommendations contained in geologic and geotechnical reports in the final design and construction specifications; preparation and implementation of erosion and sediment control plans; de-watering of excavations and shoring of temporary cuts during construction of underground facilities; and a Phase II investigation and remedial action, if warranted, at the Corporation Yard. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: GSS-A1, GSS-C1, GSS-D1, GSS-E1, and GSS-E2. Additional Mitigation Measures that minimize impacts to construction in areas of unconsolidated fill include HYD-A1 and HYD-A2. See Evidence h) in this Finding. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure GSS-A1 has been revised to clarify the setbacks for structural foundation elements for Area K under Slope Stability. GSS-C1 has been revised to correct a typographical error reference to Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment because the revisions only clarify the mitigation requirements and do not decrease any mitigation requirements. See Section 3.6 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.
- h) Hydrology & Water Quality. Potentially significant impacts to hydrology and water quality have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require on-site detention of stormwater at development sites; oil/grease separators at parking lots; preparation and implementation of a final drainage plan; maintenance and monitoring of drainage and flood control facilities; preparation and implementation of a SWPPP during construction and an Integrated Pest Management Program for the driving range; and inspection and maintenance of drainage facilities to ensure function and minimize discharge of pollutants. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: HYD-A1, HYD-A2, and HYD-C1 to HYD-C3. Additional Mitigation Measures that minimize impacts to surface water quality include GSS-C1 and GSS-D1. See Evidence g) in this Finding. See Section 3.7 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR.
- i) Land Use & Recreation. Potentially significant impacts to land use and



- recreation have been mitigated to a less than significant level through a mitigation measure that requires preparation and implementation of a manure management plan in Mitigation Measure AQ-E1. See Evidence c) in this Finding. See Section 3.8 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR.
- j) Noise & Vibration. Potentially significant impacts of noise and vibration have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require noise-reducing treatments on parking structure fan systems; limitations on hours of construction; location of equipment from sensitive receptors as far as practicable; shielding, shrouding, or use of sound-control devices on equipment; shutting off equipment when not in use; using short travel routes; and disseminating essential construction schedule information to residents including complaint contact numbers and relocation provisions. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: NOI-A1, NOI-B1 to B8, and NOI-C1. See Section 3.9 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR.
- k) Public Services & Utilities. Potentially significant impacts on public services and utilities have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require implementation of vegetation management plans and maintenance in high-risk fire areas; implementation of fire safety precautions when performing maintenance on open space areas; improved water flow to ensure proper fire flow; and coordination with utility service providers to reduce service interruptions during construction. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: PSU-C1 to C3 and PSU-F1. See Section 3.10 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR.
- l) Transportation & Circulation. Potentially significant impacts on transportation and circulation have been mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures that require compliance with the Del Monte Forest Transportation Policy Agreement; changes to roadway design or internal circulation patterns at The Lodge at Pebble Beach, the Colton Building, The Inn at Spanish Bay, and the Pebble Beach Links Driving Range; preparation and implementation of an alternative transportation plan and expansion of shuttle and valet systems; and stenciling the word “route” after the bicycle symbols on the designated route for bicycling between the Pacific Grove Gate and Stevenson Drive at Ondulado Road. Additional potentially significant impacts on transportation and circulation that are significant and unavoidable that would not be mitigated to a less than significant level are discussed in Finding 4. The Mitigation Measures from the DEIR are: TRA-A1 to A4, TRA-C1 to C5, TRA-C6(C) to C10(C)<sup>2</sup>, TRA-D1 to D10; TRA-G1, TRA-G2, and TRA-H1. In the FEIR, Mitigation Measure TRA-C2 has been revised to include the modifications to the SR 68 Widening project as modified by the City of Monterey’s Condition of Approval #19 for the CHOMP expansion permit. TRA-C4 has been revised to clarify that the calculation of the regional impact fee shall take into account the direct fair share for impacts noted in TRA-C2 relative to the Highway 68 Widening Project and any payments made by the Applicant for construction of Phase 1B improvement. TRA-G1 has been revised to clarify that the alternative transportation plan must also identify a reporting and enforcement mechanism. TRA-C6(C), TRA-C7(C), and TRA-C9(C) have been revised to clarify the estimated share of impact and

---

<sup>2</sup> The (C) at the end of the mitigation measure refers to a mitigation measure that addresses a significant cumulative impact.

estimated mitigation fair-share fee. TRA-C8(C) has been revised to include the modifications made in TRA-C2 and to clarify the estimated mitigation fair-share contribution. The revised measures are equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and they will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment for the following reasons: revisions to TRA-C2 provide for a modification that will still result in the subject intersections meeting level of service standards; TRA-C4 has only been clarified in terms of calculation of fair-share payments; TRA-G1 has been enhanced by adding reporting and enforcement requirements; and other measures have only been clarified in terms of the estimated mitigation fee amount. See Section 3.11 of the Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR and Chapter 4 of the Pebble Beach Company Final EIR.

- m) The Subdivision Committee held a public hearing on the project on April 9, 2012 in which the revisions to the mitigation measures were addressed. The revised mitigation measures are made conditions of project approval.
- n) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.

4. **FINDING:** **SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS** – Per CEQA Statute section 21081(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures identified in the environmental impact report.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The EIR identified potentially significant impacts to Air Quality, Transportation & Circulation, and Water Supply & Demand which could result from the project. These impacts are significant and unavoidable and would not be mitigated to a less than significant level even with incorporation of mitigation measures from the EIR into the conditions of project approval.
  - b) Air Quality. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts to air quality from construction-related fugitive dust and construction-related exhaust emissions. Impacts will be reduced in severity with the implementation of mitigation measures AQ-C1, AQ-C2, and AQ-E1, the proposed project would result in a short-term increase in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions due to grading and construction. Even with the implementation of mitigation measures to control fugitive dust and construction-related exhaust emissions during project construction, the proposed project would still exceed the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District's significance threshold of 82 pounds/day with a maximum PM<sub>10</sub> of approximately 550 pounds/day expected to occur in March 2014 based on the DEIR assumptions of the construction schedule. This is a short-term, construction-related environmental impact.
  - c) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts and cumulative impacts to traffic during project construction. The construction traffic and workers for the proposed project would add traffic to locations that are already experiencing deficient traffic operations. This is considered a potentially significant impact at all development sites, but is reduced in severity with the implementation of mitigation measures TRA-A1 to TRA-A4. However, even with mitigation, it is possible that construction traffic may exacerbate existing unacceptable conditions on certain roadways outside Del Monte Forest and thus the project's

contribution to cumulative traffic impacts during construction is considered significant and unavoidable. This is a short-term, construction-related environmental impact.

- d) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts to roadway intersections and regional highway sections during project operations. The traffic analysis for the proposed project shows that three intersections during AM and PM peak hour are expected to experience a significant impact under 2015 with-project conditions:
- SR 68/Skyline Forest Drive: This unsignalized intersection currently operates at LOS F. Mitigation Measure TRA-C1 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to improvements at the intersection. With construction of the improvements identified in this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS A. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
  - SR 68/Carmel Hill Professional Center: This unsignalized intersection currently operates at LOS F. Mitigation Measure TRA-C2 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to construct the full SR 68 Widening Project. With construction of the improvements identified this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS A at the best AM and PM peak hour movements, improve to LOS C with the worst AM peak hour movement, and remain at LOS F with the worst PM peak hour movement. This represents an improvement over existing conditions. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built.
  - SR 1 /Ocean Avenue: This signalized intersection currently operates at an acceptable LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour and an unacceptable LOS D in the PM peak hour. The intersection will operate at LOS D during the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2015 with-project conditions. Mitigation Measure TRA-C3 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to improvements at the intersection. With construction of the improvements identified this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C in the AM and PM peak hours. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
- e) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts to regional highway sections during project operations. The traffic analysis for the proposed project shows that three regional highway sections during AM and PM peak hour and two regional highway sections during the PM peak hour are expected to experience a significant impact under 2015 with-project conditions:
- SR 1 from Munras Street to Fremont Street (PM peak hour);
  - SR 1 from Fremont Street to Fremont Boulevard (AM & PM peak

hours);

- SR 1 north of SR 156 (AM & PM peak hours);
- SR 68 east of Laguna Seca Recreation Area (AM & PM peak hours);
- SR 156 from SR 1 to US 101 (PM peak hour).

Mitigation Measure TRA-C4 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to improvements to SR 1, SR 68, and SR 156 based on the conditions described in the Transportation Agency for Monterey County's Regional Development Impact Fee Program. Even with implementation of the measure, this impact remains significant and unavoidable due to the lack of a regional transportation improvement program to address all regional highway deficiencies. This impact would also be significant and unavoidable between the completion of proposed project construction and the completion of regional highway improvements included in the TAMC regional program.

- f) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts and cumulative impacts to the SR 1 northbound on-ramp merge from SR 68 (west). With the project, the ramp would deteriorate from LOS C to LOS D under existing conditions and would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour under cumulative plus project conditions. Mitigation Measure TRA-C5 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement. With construction of this measure, the ramp would improve to LOS B and LOS C during AM and PM peak hours, respectively. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
- g) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant cumulative impacts to roadway intersections and segments. The traffic analysis for the proposed project shows that four intersections during AM peak hour and seven intersections during PM peak hour are expected to experience a significant impact under cumulative 2030 with-project conditions:
- Sunset Drive (SR 68)/Congress Road (AM & PM peak hour): This intersection is expected to deteriorate from an acceptable to an unacceptable LOS in 2030 with the project's contribution. Mitigation Measure TRA-C6(C) requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement. With construction of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
  - Forest Avenue (SR 68)/David Avenue (PM peak hour): This signalized intersection operates at LOS D and the project will increase in the intersection's critical movement V/C ratio in 2030. Mitigation Measure TRA-C7(C) requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement. With construction of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C. This impact remains significant and unavoidable

during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.

- SR 68/Skyline Forest Drive (AM & PM peak hour): See Evidence c in this Finding.
  - SR 68/Carmel Hill Professional Center (AM & PM peak hour): This unsignalized intersection currently operates at LOS F. Mitigation Measure TRA-C2 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to construct the full SR 68 Widening Project. With construction of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C under cumulative conditions. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built.
  - SR 68/SR 1 Southbound Off-Ramp (AM & PM peak hour): This signalized intersection currently operates at an unacceptable LOS F. Mitigation Measure TRA-C8(C) requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
  - SR 68/Aguajito Road (PM peak hour): This unsignalized intersection currently operates at LOS E and F. Mitigation Measure TRA-C9(C) requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement at the intersection. This impact remains significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
  - SR 1 /Carpenter Street (PM peak hour): This signalized intersection is expected to continue to operate at LOS E and the project will increase in the intersection's critical movement V/C ratio in 2030. Mitigation Measure TRA-C10(C) requires the project to pay fair share contribution to the improvement. Construction of this measure would offset the impact of the proposed project, but the deficiency would remain. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable during the interim period between when the impact occurs and when the improvement is actually built. This impact would also remain significant and unavoidable if sufficient funds are not derived from other sources or if fair-share fees for this mitigation are instead concentrated to pay for other proposed mitigation.
- h) Transportation & Circulation. The DEIR identified potentially significant cumulative impacts to regional highway sections during project operations. The traffic analysis for the proposed project shows that regional highway sections during AM and/or PM peak hour are expected to experience a significant cumulative impact under 2030 with-project conditions:
- SR 1 from SR 68 (west) to Munras Avenue (AM peak hour).

- SR 1 from Munras Avenue to Fremont Street (AM and PM peak hours).
- SR1 from Fremont Boulevard to Imjin Parkway (PM peak hour)
- SR 1 north of SR 156 (AM peak hour).
- SR 68 east of Olmsted (AM and PM peak hours)
- US 101 north of SR 156 (PM peak hour).
- SR 1 from SR 68 (west) to Munras Avenue (PM peak hour).
- SR 1 from Fremont Street to Fremont Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours).
- SR 1 north of SR 156 (AM and PM peak hours).
- SR 68 west of Skyline Forest Drive (AM and PM peak hours).
- SR 68 east of Laguna Seca Recreation Area (AM and PM peak hours).
- SR 156 from SR 1 to US 101 (PM peak hour).

Mitigation Measure TRA-C4 requires the project to pay fair share contribution to improvements to SR 1, SR 68, and SR 156 based on the conditions described in TAMC's RDIF Program. Even with implementation of the measure, this impact remains significant and unavoidable due to the lack of a regional transportation improvement program to address all regional highway deficiencies. This impact would also be significant and unavoidable between the completion of proposed project construction and the completion of regional highway improvements included in the TAMC regional program.

- i) Water Supply & Demand. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts and cumulative impacts to water supply and demand. The project's water demand would represent an increase in water use above the 2011 Existing Conditions, but would be within the Applicant's current entitlement and could be legally supplied by California American Water (Cal-Am) through 2016. However, given the current uncertain nature of regional water supplies, the additional project water demand could intensify water supply shortfalls and rationing starting in 2017, if the Regional Project (or its equivalent) is not built by then. The project could obtain water in 2017 and thereafter if the Regional Project (or its equivalent) is not completed by then, but would be subject to deep rationing and would intensify the level of rationing for existing users which is considered a significant unavoidable water supply impact. Additionally, it may take many years before the project's full water demand is realized, in particular due to residential demand as it may take many years before all of the project's proposed lots are actually built out and their water demands come on line. The same is true for new cumulative water demand related to the Applicant's sale of a portion of its water entitlement (as of Fall 2011, while 117 acre-feet (AF) of the entitlement had been sold to other parties, only 30 AF was actually in use). Thus, in the short and near-term, the estimates of project and other entitlement demand likely overstate the demand that will actually occur, and thus provide a worst-case analysis of potential impacts.
- j) Water Supply & Demand. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts to water infrastructure capacity. Local water infrastructure is included to serve the proposed project and existing supply infrastructure outside the project area is adequate to serve the project through 2016. The Regional Project (or its equivalent) will need to be built by 2017 to serve existing demand and the increase in demand from the project. Regional water supply infrastructure and operations will have secondary environmental impacts and the project would indirectly contribute to these

secondary physical impacts on the environment because the project would add additional demand for new regional water supply infrastructure. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. For the Regional Project, the California Public Utilities Commission has documented the reasons why further mitigation is not available to reduce identified significant and unavoidable impacts.

- k) Water Supply & Demand. The DEIR identified potentially significant impacts to Carmel River biological resources. The project's water demand would result in increased withdrawals from the Carmel River through 2016 and thus would have a significant and unavoidable impact on Carmel River biological resources. After 2017, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) mandated reductions in Cal-Am withdrawals from the Carmel River will not be changed by the project demand. After 2016, SWRCB Order WR95-10 and Order WR2009-0060 will result in a substantial reduction in Cal-Am withdrawals from the Carmel River. Because the SWRCB orders cap the amount that Cal-Am can withdraw from the Carmel River, the potential provision of water from the river to the project from either the Carmel River or from the Regional Project (or an equivalent) would not result in any change in the amount of Cal-Am withdrawals from the Carmel River. Thus, the project would not have a significant impact on biological resources in the Carmel River after 2016.
- l) Water Supply & Demand. In 2012, there have been several proposals developed to provide alternatives to the former Regional Water Supply Project. Cal-Am submitted an application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in April 2012 for a multi-source water supply project that would provide the same amount of water as Phase 1 of the Regional Project (15,200 AFY) through a desalination project (5,500 AFY, expandable to 9,000 AFY), increased aquifer storage and recovery (1,300 AFY), and water purchase from the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District/Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MPWMD/MRWPCA) Groundwater Replenishment Project (3,500 FY). Cal-Am is partnering with the MPWMD (for the aquifer storage and recovery element) and the MRWPCA (for the groundwater recharge element). The Cal-Am project has not yet completed its environmental analysis, although the prior CPUC EIR did evaluate impacts associated with all three sources of water proposed in the new project. Nader Agha, a private developer, has also proposed an alternative desalination project, referred to as the "People's Moss Landing Desalination Project", which consists of a desalination project, located at Moss Landing, that would be capable of producing up to 10,700 AFY of water. The City of Pacific Grove has recently decided to partner with Mr. Agha on the project. Mr. Agha's project has not yet gone through environmental review yet. Because these alternatives to the Regional Water Supply Project have not undergone environmental review, it is premature to identify the specific project-level impacts of these alternatives. The CPUC EIR disclosed in general, the potential environmental impacts of desalination, aquifer storage and recovery, and groundwater replenishment but did not specifically evaluate the new Cal-Am proposal or Mr. Agha's proposal.

The Draft EIR for the Pebble Beach project discloses that the Regional Water Supply Project faced substantial obstacles to implementation and that an alternative water supply project may be necessary in order to provide the

Monterey Peninsula with water, including water for the proposed Pebble Beach project. The Draft EIR also discloses that there may be significant unavoidable secondary impacts of such water supply project infrastructure and also discloses the potential impacts on water rationing if an alternative water supply is not developed by 2017. Thus, the EIR for the Pebble Beach project appropriately discloses the general potential secondary impacts of alternative water supply infrastructure to the extent that they have been evaluated to date and discloses potential significant and unavoidable impacts if the alternative water supply projects are not built prior to a potential cutoff of Cal-Am's illegal supply from the Carmel River in 2017.

- m) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.

5. **FINDING:** **MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM** - Per CEQA Statute section 21081.6, the County of Monterey shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) In recommending approval of the project, the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the project.
  - b) The mitigation measures identified in the final EIR are incorporated as conditions of approval and are included in Attachment 2 of Resolution No. 12-019 for the project.
  - c) The Applicant/Owner of the project will be required to enter into an "Agreement to Implement a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan" as a condition of approval for the project.
  - d) The Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors find that the mitigation measures incorporated into and imposed on the project, including mitigation measures that were revised in the FEIR, will not have new significant environmental impacts that were not already analyzed in the FEIR for the project.
  - e) See Finding 3.
  - f) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.
  - g) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for the proposed development found in Project File PLN100138.

6. **FINDING:** **ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT** - Per CEQA Statute section 21081(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) **No Project Alternative.** Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no renovation, expansion, or creation of new visitor-serving development, no new residential subdivisions, and no new trails. The SR 1/SR 68/17-Mile Drive intersection reconfiguration and the four internal intersection improvements would not be built by the applicant. The new preservation areas would not be secured with new conservation easements. Without the proposed project and its proposed subdivisions, it is still possible that single-family residential development could occur on certain existing legal



lots within the project area. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have fewer impacts to the environmental issues and resources than the proposed project would impact. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives of expanding and improving existing visitor-serving uses, developing a reduced number of large residential lots from that allowed in the current LUP, concentrating residential lots in or adjacent to existing development, and formally preserving large undeveloped tracts of forested open space.

In addition, the No Project Alternative would not provide the Pebble Beach Company with the needed capital to pay for the restoration and long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat and the public access components of the Concept Plan. Thus, approval of this alternative would mean that the Concept Plan itself would fail and an additional 635 acres would not be placed into permanent open space. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

b) Alternative 1 – Clustered Development Options A-C.

- Alternative 1A would include 90 market-rate residential lots but would relocate all proposed 13 residential lots from Area J (5 lots) and Area K (8 lots) to Area F-2 (16 lots) and Area I-2 (16 lots). Areas J and K contain Monterey pine forest, Yadon's piperia, streams and wetlands, and CRLF breeding habitat. Area K has the largest population of Yadon's piperia of all the proposed development sites (the majority of Yadon's piperia in Del Monte Forest is located within the proposed preservation sites). Areas F-2 and I-2 were selected as development locations because they are completely surrounded by development and, as such, their natural resources are isolated and fragmented from larger undeveloped areas in Del Monte Forest. This alternative would include 18 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.
- Alternative 1B would include 90 market-rate residential lots but would relocate all proposed residential lots from Area K (8 lots) and Area L (10 lots) to Areas F-2 and I-2. The proposed development area at Area L contains Monterey pine forest adjacent to the Del Monte Forest Foundation Indian Village preservation area. Although Area L also contains dune habitat, these areas are already preserved in an existing conservation easement. The project could have indirect effects on the dune area, as described in Section 3.3, Biological Resources, which would be avoided by not developing adjacent areas. Area L also contains several streams, CRLF habitat, and a small population of Yadon's piperia, but the proposed project includes these resources within the proposed preservation areas. This alternative would include 18 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.
- Alternative 1C would include 90 market-rate residential lots but would restrict and reconfigure building envelopes in Areas F-2, I-2, J, K, L, U, V, and the Special Events Staging Area to avoid all direct impacts to Yadon's piperia. This alternative would include 18 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.

Overall, the impacts and required mitigation of Alternative 1 would be similar to those of the proposed project with the exception of impacts to Monterey pine forest and Yadon's piperia and other biological resources in Areas J, K and L which are reduced. Alternative 1 does not reduce one or

more impacts to less than significant, with the exception of Alternative 1C, nor does it create additional significant impacts. Because of the addition of 18 units of inclusionary housing in Alternative 1, the significant unavoidable impacts related to project water demand are slightly higher in the event of no new regional water supply and related to indirect impacts associated with new regional water supply development. All three Alternative 1 clustered development options would meet most of the project objectives, but the lots in certain subdivisions would be smaller in size and thus would not meet the specific project objective for large lots as well as the proposed project would.

The relocation of lots is not consistent with the Local Coastal Plan Amendment (“LCP”) certified by the California Coastal Commission on May 9, 2012 and adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 22, 2012. Alternative 1 proposes higher densities at Area F-2 and I-2 than are allowed in the Concept Plan/LCP. The reduction in size of the market-rate lots would make the project infeasible as the Pebble Beach Company would likely not have the capital to pay for the restoration and long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat and the public access components of the Concept Plan. Thus, approval of this alternative would likely mean that the Concept Plan itself would fail, including its long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat, the public access components, and certain retirement of development potential on 635 acres of ESHA. Finally, this alternative does not eliminate any significant impacts of the proposed project that cannot be addressed through mitigation identified in the EIR. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

c) Alternative 2 – Reduced Development Options A-C.

- Alternative 2A would eliminate residential development in Areas J and K to reduce biological resource impacts as well as traffic and water supply impacts. Biological resources in these areas were discussed in Alternative 1. This alternative would result in 77 market-rate units in Del Monte Forest (compared to 90 with the proposed project). This alternative would include 16 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.
- Alternative 2B would eliminate development in Areas K and L to reduce biological resource impacts as well as traffic and water supply impacts. Biological resources in these areas are discussed in Alternative 1. This alternative would result in 72 market-rate units in Del Monte Forest (compared to 90 with the proposed project). This alternative would include 15 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.
- Alternative 2C would reduce development to avoid all direct impacts on Yadon’s piperia and reduce traffic and water impacts by eliminating lots or modifying development areas in Areas F-2, I-2, J, K, U, V, and the Special Events Staging Area. This alternative would result in 64 market rate units in Del Monte Forest (compared to 90 with the proposed project). This alternative would include 13 inclusionary units in attached housing at the Corporation Yard.

Overall, the impacts and required mitigation of Alternative 2 would be slightly greater with Alternative 2A, or slightly less with Alternatives 2B and 2C than those of the proposed project with the exception of impacts to

Monterey pine forest and Yadon's piperia and other biological resources in Areas J, K and L which are reduced. Alternative 2 does not reduce one or more impacts to less than significant, with the exception of Alternative 2C, nor does it create additional significant impacts. All three Alternative 2 options would meet most of the project objectives, but they would not provide for as many market-rate lots as the proposed project would provide. All three Alternative 2 options would eliminate lots instead of changing their configuration and thus would meet the specific large lot objective where lots are retained, except at the Corporation Yard. All three Alternative 2 options would not meet the specific project objective for large lots at the Corporation Yard.

The reduction in the number of market-rate lots would make the project infeasible as the Pebble Beach Company would likely not have the capital to pay for the restoration and long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat and the public access components of the Concept Plan. Thus, approval of this alternative would likely mean that the Concept Plan itself would fail, including its long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat, the public access components, and certain retirement of development potential on 635 acres of ESHA. Finally, this alternative does not eliminate any significant impacts of the proposed project that cannot be addressed through mitigation identified in the EIR. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

- d) Alternative 3 – Driving Range Redesign. Alternative 3 would redesign the relocated Pebble Beach Driving Range to avoid the 0.2-acre habitat area with Pacific Grove clover in the far northwest corner of Collins Field near the proposed tee box. Overall, the impacts and required mitigation of Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed project except there would be no direct impact on Pacific Grove clover because impacts would be avoided entirely.

Alternative 3 does not create additional significant impacts. Alternative 3 meets all of the project objectives. Therefore, this alternative has been incorporated into the proposed project.

- e) Alternative 4 – Spanish Bay Underground Employee Parking. Alternative 4 would include a 285-space underground parking lot at The Inn at Spanish Bay, to replace the proposed 285-space surface employee parking lot in Area B, to avoid impacts on Monterey pine forest in Area B. The underground parking lot would be located nominally under the tennis courts in approximately the same location as the 443-space underground parking garage that was proposed as part of the prior project and studied in the 2005 EIR. Overall, impacts and required mitigation of Alternative 4 would be similar to or slightly greater for a number of resource areas than those identified for the proposed project because of additional impacts occurring from an additional underground structure; operational impacts related to aesthetics and biological resources would be lower. Alternative 4 does not reduce one or more impacts to less than significant and, in fact, creates additional significant impacts to Geology, Seismicity & Soils and Transportation & Circulation. This alternative would increase the potential for structural failure because it would be located in an area of shallow groundwater and weak surrounding soil deposits. In addition to the mitigation identified for the proposed project, this alternative would require

implementation of specific measures identified in a site-specific geotechnical report and drainage plan prepared for an underground parking structure at this location. Additional traffic analysis would be required to determine if site-specific impacts require additional design mitigation.

Alternative 4 meets all of the project objectives, but the Alternative creates additional significant impacts to Geology, Seismicity & Soils and Transportation & Circulation. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

- f) Alternative 5 – Roundabout at the SR 68/SR 1/17-Mile Drive Interchange. Alternative 5 was developed by the City of Monterey and has been included in this analysis upon their request because it would result in better traffic conditions at this interchange than either the proposed Phase 1B improvement or the Regional Transportation Plan’s Highway 68 Widening Project. However, as described in Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation, the Phase 1B improvement included in the proposed project would substantially improve traffic conditions compared to a no project condition. As a result, the roundabout is an alternative to this project element, but the alternative would not avoid a significant unavoidable impact of the proposed project and thus is not necessary to address an identified significant unavoidable impact of the project. Overall, impacts and required mitigation of Alternative 5 would be similar to those of the proposed project; however, this alternative would lower several project impacts, such as Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and thus lower the amount of mitigation that would be necessary. This alternative would also lower several project impacts not found to be significant, such as operational criteria pollutant emissions.

All in all, Alternative 5 does not reduce one or more impacts to less than significant nor does it create any additional significant impacts. Alternative 5 meets all of the project objectives. However, at present, this alternative does not meet Caltrans’ access requirements, has no Caltrans approval, and thus is not feasible today. This alternative is only feasible if Caltrans were to adopt this alternative at some future date, which cannot be known at this time. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

- g) Environmentally Superior Alternative. Each of the alternatives either avoided or minimized to a greater extent the impacts associated with the proposed project. When all the alternatives were considered, the No Project Alternative is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative because only the No Project Alternative avoided all the impacts related to the proposed project. However, Section 15126.6(e) of CEQA requires that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then another alternative must be identified amongst the alternatives considered as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Therefore, the Reduced Development Option 2C is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it meets most of the Pebble Beach Company project objectives with incrementally less environmental impacts to because it reduces the impacts on Biological Resources (Monterey pine forest and Yadon’s piperia), has lower air quality impacts (due to less construction), less traffic and a lower water demand compared to the other action alternatives (as well as the proposed project). This alternative would also reduce the levels of impact related noise and water quality. This alternative would reduce but not eliminate any of the significant unavoidable impacts

of the proposed project. Alternative 2C would meet most of the project objectives, but it would provide 26 less market rate units over the proposed project. Alternative 2C would eliminate market-rate lots instead of changing the configuration and thus would meet the specific large lot objective where lots are retained, except at the Corporation Yard. Alternative 2C would not meet the specific project objective for large lots at the Corporation Yard.

The reduction in the number of market-rate lots would make the project infeasible as the Pebble Beach Company would likely not have the capital to pay for the restoration and long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat and the public access components of the Concept Plan. Thus, approval of this alternative would likely mean that the Concept Plan itself would fail, including its long-term preservation and maintenance of forest habitat, the public access components, and certain retirement of development potential on 635 acres of ESHA. Finally, this alternative does not eliminate any significant impacts of the proposed project that cannot be addressed through mitigation identified in the EIR. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

- h) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.
- i) The California Coastal Commission Staff Report for the May 9, 2012 public hearing for Monterey County Major Amendment Number 1-12 Part 1 (Del Monte Forest Update and Pebble Beach Company Concept Plan).

7. **FINDING:** **STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS** – Per CEQA Statute section 21081(b), with respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under section 21081(a)(3), the County of Monterey finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The proposed project will result in development that will provide benefits described herein to the surrounding community and the County has a whole.
  - b) The project will create economic benefits to the county and the economy through the creation of jobs for construction (temporary) and for the expanded resort operations (permanent) and the creation of new property tax revenue through higher property valuation.
  - c) The project will create benefits to other tourism destinations on the Monterey Peninsula as noted during public testimony made at the Planning Commission Workshop on November 9, 2011 and at the Board of Supervisors Hearing on January 24, 2012 by Mark Stilwell and Moe Ammar.
  - d) The project will permanently preserve approximately 635 acres of open space. This property will be permanently protected and managed to enhance habitat values. The approval of visitor-serving and residential development provides a reliable revenue stream to the Applicant to provide adequate funding to manage the rare and sensitive habitats and species found in the new open space without reliance on uncertain external or public sources of funding.
  - e) The project will reduce the potential number of housing units that could be developed on Areas B, C, F, G, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, U, and V as noted on Table A in the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan from 891 units to 90 to 100 units. The project is also reduced intensity build-out plan compared to prior proposals for the Del Monte Forest. The proposed project would result

in the buildout of the Del Monte Forest consisting of 195 to 205 residential units (including 90 to 100 residential units with the proposed project, 96 units on existing vacant lots, and 9 units in areas outside the project area) compared to as many as 403 units in prior proposals.

- f) The project will create road, parking, trail and other infrastructure improvements that will enhance coastal access and benefit the entire Monterey Peninsula.
- g) The project will include new visitor-serving development that would increase the number of hotel rooms allowed in the Del Monte Forest from 460 to 700. This increase would lead to an increase in transient occupancy tax (TOT) receipts in the County.
- h) The project would resolve over 20 years of controversy surrounding the buildout of the Del Monte Forest and thus would avoid future County staff expenditures in land use planning and environmental processing.
- i) The related Local Coastal Plan Amendment was unanimously certified by the California Coastal Commission on May 9, 2012. The Board of Supervisors acknowledged the certification and adopted a resolution amending the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan on May 22, 2012.
- j) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.
- k) Table A in the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, certified by the California Coastal Commission on May 19, 1987.
- l) Public testimony made at the Planning Commission Workshop on November 9, 2011.
- m) Public testimony made at the Planning Commission Hearing on December 14, 2011 and the Board of Supervisors Hearing on January 24, 2012.
- n) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for the proposed development found in Project File PLN100138.

8. **FINDING:** **RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED** – In accordance with Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County of Monterey is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review but before certification. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:
- 1) A new significant environmental impact resulting from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;
  - 2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance;
  - 3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure, considerably different from others previously analyzed, that clearly would lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but that the project’s proponents decline to adopt; or
  - 4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) Recirculation of the draft EIR is not required where the new information merely clarifies, amplifies or makes minor modifications to an adequate EIR. The information provided meets those criteria.
  - b) All the text revisions in the draft EIR provide clarification and additional

detail. After considering all comments received on the draft EIR, the County has determined that the changes do not result in a need to recirculate the draft EIR.

- c) See Finding 1, 3, and 5.
- d) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.

9. **FINDING:** **FISH AND GAME FEE** – For purposes of the Fish and Game Code, the project will have a significant adverse impact on the fish and wildlife resources upon which the wildlife depends.
- a) State Department of Fish and Game reviewed the DEIR to comment and recommended necessary mitigations to protect biological resources in this area. Therefore, the project will be required to pay the State fee in effect at the time of the recordation of the Notice of Determination to the Monterey County Clerk/Recorder for processing said fee and posting the Notice of Determination (NOD).
  - b) See Finding 3 d).
  - c) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for the proposed development found in Project File PLN100138.
  - d) Pebble Beach Company Draft EIR dated November 2011 and Final EIR dated April 2012.

### **DECISION**

**NOW, THEREFORE**, based on the above findings and evidence, the Planning Commission does hereby:

1. Consider the draft Environmental Impact Report with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan;
2. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors certify the EIR based on the findings and evidence;
3. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan; and
4. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 30th day of May, 2012, upon motion of Commissioner Diehl, seconded by Commissioner Rochester, by the following vote:

AYES: Roberts, Vandever, Rochester, Getzelman, Diehl, Mendez, Hert, Padilla  
NOES: Brown  
ABSENT: Salazar  
ABSTAIN: None

  
Mike Novo, Secretary

COPY OF THIS DECISION MAILED TO APPLICANT ON

**JUN 08 2012**

# ATTACHMENT 1 to RESOLUTION No. 12-019A

Table ES-3. Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### 3.1. Aesthetics

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL - EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Scenic Vistas and Corridors</b>										
AES-A1. The proposed project could have substantial adverse visual effects on public viewing in or near “visually prominent” areas identified in the LUP and along the 17-Mile Drive corridor.	○	⊙	○	⊙	⊙	⊙	-	○	-	⊙
AES-A2. The proposed roadway improvements could adversely affect views from 17-Mile Drive.	-	-	-	-	-	-	⊙	-	-	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	AES-A1. Incorporate design features and landscaping requirements in design plans and specifications for all development sites that involve construction of new structures or modification of existing structures. AES-A2. Prepare and implement a landscape plan for SR 1/SR 68/17-Mile Drive intersection reconfiguration and internal roadway improvements.									
<b>B. Visual Character/Building Scale and Mass</b>										
AES-B1. The proposed project could degrade the visual character and quality of some development sites (at The Inn at Spanish Bay, Area M Spyglass Hill, Residential Lot Subdivisions, and 17-Mile Drive intersections).	○	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	○	-	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	AES-A1, AES-A2. See above.									
<b>C. Light and Glare</b>										
AES-C1. The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare at development sites, which could affect nighttime views or activities in the area.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									
Mitigation Measures:	AES-C1. Incorporate light and glare reduction measures in design plans and specifications.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. - = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts



3.2 Air Quality

Project Impact	Project Elements										Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EC	Area M		SUB	RD	TRA	INF		
				MH	MR						
<b>A. Air Quality Plan Consistency</b>											
AQ-A1. The proposed project would be consistent with the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan.	— (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										○
<b>B. Long-Term Emissions</b>											
AQ-B1. The proposed project would result in a long-term increase in ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 emissions due to vehicular traffic generated by development, but would not exceed air quality standards of daily emissions thresholds.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										○
<b>C. Construction Emissions</b>											
AQ-C1. The proposed project would result in a short-term increase in PM10 emissions due to grading and construction.	● (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										●
Mitigation Measures:	AQ-C1. Implement measures to control fugitive dust emissions. AQ-C2. Implement measures to control construction-related exhaust emissions.										
<b>D. Sensitive Receptors</b>											
AQ-D1. The proposed project would result in the emission of diesel toxic air contaminants, which pose a risk to human health, from diesel truck and equipment use during construction.	⊙	○	⊙	○	○	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
Mitigation Measures:	AQ-C2. Implement measures to control construction-related exhaust emissions.										
AQ-D2. The proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to less-than-substantial pollutant concentrations of CO from project-related traffic.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										⊙
<b>E. Odors</b>											
AQ-E1. The proposed project would expose new sensitive receptors to objectionable odors from the Equestrian Center.	○	○	⊙	○	○	⊙	○	○	○	—	
Mitigation Measures:	AQ-E1. Prepare and implement a manure management plan.										

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.3 Biological Resources

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas</b>										
BIO-A1. Project development would result in direct removal and indirect disturbance to ESHA areas while preserving far larger areas of ESHA.	—	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	⊙	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1. Develop and implement a site-specific resource management plan, based on the Master RMP, for each preservation area. BIO-A2. Dedicate conservation easements to the Del Monte Forest Foundation for all preservation areas. Additional Mitigation Measures for individual resources are noted below (BIO-B1, BIO-B2, etc.)									
<b>B. Sensitive Habitats</b>										
BIO-B1. Project development would result in direct disturbance and indirect impacts on Monterey pine forest (including maritime chaparral) while preserving far larger areas of Monterey pine forest (including maritime chaparral).	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-B1(C). Dedicate additional area of undeveloped Monterey pine forest.									
BIO-B2. Project development would result in potential direct and indirect disturbance of coastal dune habitat near Areas M and L while preserving the entire remnant dune area in Area M.	—	—	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A-2. See above. BIO-B2. Include additional measures in the resource management plan to avoid indirect impacts on dune habitat near Areas M and L.									
BIO-B3. Project would indirectly disturb Monterey pygmy forest and other sensitive plant habitat areas and plant and wildlife species in the HHNHA due to increased trail use and adjacent residential use.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-B3. Include additional measures in the resource management plan for Huckleberry Hill Natural Habitat Area to avoid indirect trail use impacts on sensitive resources and use directed lighting at the Corporation Yard residential area.									
<b>C. Wetlands/Waters</b>										
BIO-C1. Project development would result in potential disturbance of 0.05 acre of wetlands/drainages and result in indirect effects to wetlands and waters in and adjacent to project development areas.	—	—	⊙	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-C1. Avoid or compensate for the loss of wetlands and implement resource management measures to maintain wetlands in the preservation areas. HYD-A1. Ensure on-site detention of stormwater run-off at development sites and oil/grease separators at parking lots; prepare final drainage plan with flow calculations and construction detail, and implement approved drainage plan. HYD-A2. Maintain and monitor drainage and flood control facilities, and prepare annual report(s) that describe the condition, maintenance performed, and required improvements of drainage and flood control facilities. HYD-C1. Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan to prevent and reduce sediments and contaminants in stormwater runoff during construction. HYD-C2. Provide regular inspection and maintenance of operational best management practices to ensure function and minimize the discharge of pollutants to surface water. HYD-C3. Prepare and implement an integrated pest management program for the relocated Pebble Beach Driving Range.									
<b>D. Special-Status Plant Species</b>										
BIO-D1. Project development would result in the direct loss of individual Yadon's piperia plants and habitat and indirect impacts on adjacent occupied piperia habitat, while preserving far larger areas of occupied piperia habitat.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-D1. Implement resource management measures to maintain and enhance Yadon's piperia habitat.									

Notes:

● = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.

○ = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project's Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
BIO-D2. Project development would result in potential loss or disturbance of up to 16 Gowen cypress trees due to residential development while preserving 3.5 acres of Gowen cypress/Bishop pine pygmy forest.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-D2. Restore 1.6 acres of Gowen cypress/Bishop pine habitat at the Huckleberry Hill Natural Habitat Area, and implement resource management measures to maintain and enhance Gowen cypress habitat.									
BIO-D3. Project development would result in loss of one occurrence (0.2 acre) of Pacific Grove clover and indirect effects to a second occurrence.	—	—	⊙	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-D3. Redesign the proposed driving range to avoid Pacific Grove clover, or create or enhance a 0.2-acre compensation area for this species within another preservation area on the Monterey Peninsula. BIO-D4. Manage the Indian Village occurrence of Pacific grove clover to ensure its continued survival.									
BIO-D4. Project development would result in direct loss and indirect impacts to Hooker’s manzanita habitat while preserving larger areas of habitat.	—	—	—	—	—	○	—	—	—	○
BIO-D5. Project development could result in potential loss or disturbance of pine rose and habitat for pine rose while preserving larger areas of development.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	⊙	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-D5. Conduct preconstruction surveys for pine rose, implement avoidance and protection measures, if found, and conduct construction monitoring.									
BIO-D6. Project development in Area L could result in indirect effects on one occurrence of Hickman’s potentilla.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-D6. Avoid hydrological effects to the Indian Village Hickman’s potentilla population and expand existing protection and management.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
BIO-D7. Trail development could result in small amounts of lost habitat for special-status plant species.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-D7. Minimize special-status species habitat disturbance during trail construction.									
<b>E. Special-Status Wildlife Species</b>										
BIO-E1. Project construction could result in direct mortality to California red-legged frog, degradation of aquatic habitat, loss of and degradation of upland habitats, which would be partially offset by preservation of existing known occupied and suitable habitat.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-E1. Conduct preconstruction surveys for California red-legged frog, implement protection measures if found, and conduct construction monitoring. BIO-E2. Design new California red-legged frog breeding habitat along Seal Rock Creek in accordance with criteria to establish California red-legged frog habitat characteristics.									
BIO-E2. Development in Areas L and M could result in loss of Smith's blue butterfly host plants, while preservation of Area M dunes will preserve host plant and habitat.	—	—	—	○	○	○	—	—	—	—
BIO-E3. Stormwater runoff from project developments during construction and operation could degrade nearshore water quality and result in indirect impacts on the southern sea otter, western snowy plover, California brown pelican and other marine resources, including the Carmel Bay Area of Special Biological Significance.	(Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	HYD-A1, HYD-A2, HYD-C1, HYD-C2, HYD-C3. See above. GSS-C1. Prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan. GSS-D1. Dewater excavations and shore temporary cuts during construction of underground parking facilities.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project's Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements										Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF		
				MH	MR						
BIO-E4. Project construction and development would result in potential loss or disturbance to habitat occupied by certain non-listed special-status wildlife species while preserving large, unfragmented areas of habitat for these species.	See below by specific species										
Legless Lizard	—	—	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙	
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2, BIO-B2. See above. BIO-E5. Conduct pre-construction surveys for legless lizard, implement protection measures if found, and conduct construction monitoring for ground-disturbing construction activities.										
California Horned Lizard	—	—	—	○	○	○	—	—	—	○	
Western Pond Turtle	—	—	—	—	—	○	—	—	—	○	
Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙	
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-E6. Conduct a preconstruction survey for woodrats and woodrat nests, and implement protection measures if found for ground-disturbing construction activities.										
Pallid bat	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙	
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-E7. Retain dead trees or snags wherever feasible in development and preservation areas to provide roosting habitat for pallid bats.										
Ringtails and Monterey Ornate Shrew	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙	
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2, BIO-B2. See above.										
<b>F. Common Wildlife Habitat/Populations/Plant Communities</b>											
BIO-F1. The project would remove habitat of common wildlife species and plant communities within Del Monte Forest while preserving far larger areas of habitat for common species.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above.										
<b>G. Indirect Impacts on Habitat Resulting from Human Use</b>											
BIO-G1. The project would increase trail use by pedestrians and equestrians and could adversely affect common and rare wildlife and plant species within existing and proposed preservation areas.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)										⊙

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-B2, BIO-B3, BIO-D4, BIO-D6. See above. BIO-G1. Include additional measures in the resource management plan for Preservation Areas J, K and PQR to avoid indirect trail use impacts on sensitive resources.									
<b>H. Wildlife Movement</b>										
BIO-H1. The project would fragment certain existing forested habitats and could interfere with wildlife movement while preserving larger, unfragmented areas of habitat providing wildlife movement opportunities.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1. BIO-A2. See above.									
<b>I. Wildlife Breeding and Nesting</b>										
BIO-I1. Project construction, including tree removal and grading, could result in potential disturbance to nesting raptors, including several special-status raptor species, if present during construction.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-I1. Conduct pre-construction and breeding-season raptor surveys and implement protection measures.									
<b>J. Tree Removal</b>										
BIO-J1. Project construction and development could result in removal or disturbance of native Monterey pine trees and coast live oak trees while preserving far larger areas and numbers of trees in the Del Monte Forest.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	BIO-A1, BIO-A2. See above. BIO-J1. Incorporate specific tree removal and replanting guidelines into the site-specific RMPs. BIO-J2. Protect retained trees from construction disturbance.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.4 Climate Change

Project Impacts	Project Elements									
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	Cumulative
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Contribute to Climate Change Impacts</b>										
CC-A1. The proposed project would result in project-related greenhouse gas emissions, during construction and from operation that could considerably contribute to climate change impacts and be inconsistent with the goals of Assembly Bill 32.	◎ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									
Mitigation Measures:	CC-A1. Implement best management practices for GHG emissions during construction. CC-A2-A. Reduce annual greenhouse gas emission by 26% relative to business as usual using a combination of design features, replanting, and/or offset purchases. OR CC-A2-B. Validate the greenhouse gas emission offset value of preserving Monterey Pine Forest designated for development using the Climate Action Registry Forest Project Protocol and preserve the lands in perpetuity.									
<b>B. Effects of Climate Change</b>										
CC-B1: The project would not result in significant exposure of persons or property to reasonably foreseeable impacts of climate change.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts



3.5 Cultural Resources

Project Impact	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Historical Resources</b>										
CR-A1. The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	— (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
<b>B. Archaeological Resources</b>										
CR-B1. Project grading and excavation could result in disturbance to previously undiscovered archaeological resources and cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	CR-B1. Conduct worker awareness training for archaeological and paleontological resources prior to ground-disturbing construction activities. CR-B2. Stop work if buried cultural deposits or human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities.									
<b>C. Human Remains</b>										
CR-C1. Project grading and excavation could result in disturbance to previously undiscovered human remains.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	CR-B1, CR-B2. See above.									
<b>D. Paleontological Resources</b>										
CR-D1. Project grading and excavation could result in disturbance and destruction of a previously undiscovered unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	CR-B1. See above. CR-D1. Implement stop work order if vertebrate fossil materials are encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.6 Geology, Seismicity, and Soils

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Seismic Hazards</b>										
GSS-A1. Placement of new structures could result in potential structural damage and associated human safety hazards resulting from ground shaking caused by earthquakes on nearby active and potentially active faults.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	GSS-A1. Ensure final design and construction specifications include recommendations contained in the site-specific geologic and geotechnical reports.									
<b>B. Landslides and Slope Stability</b>										
GSS-B1. Placement of buildings and grading on steep and/or unstable slopes could result in potential structural damage and associated human safety hazards from mass movements (landslides and debris flow).	—	—	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	GSS-A1. Ensure final design and construction specifications include recommendations contained in the site-specific geologic and geotechnical reports.									
<b>C. Erosion</b>										
GSS-C1. Grading and excavation could result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, and sedimentation.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	GSS-C1. Prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan.									
<b>D. Soils Constraints</b>										
GSS-D1. Construction in areas of expansive soils could result in substantial damage to overlying building foundations and roadways.	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	⊙
GSS-D2. Construction of underground structures in the presence of shallow groundwater and weak surrounding deposits could result in inadequate drainage and structural failure during construction or operation.	⊙	—	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Impact Topic	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
GSS-D3. Construction in areas of unconsolidated fill could result in settlement and substantial damage to overlying building foundations.	—	⊙	—	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	GSS-A1. Ensure final design and construction specifications include recommendations contained in site-specific geologic and geotechnical reports. GSS-D1. De-water excavations and shore temporary cuts during construction of the underground facilities. HYD-A1. Ensure on-site detention of stormwater run-off at development sites and oil/grease separators at parking lots; prepare final drainage plan with flow calculations and construction detail; and implement approved drainage plan. HYD-A2. Maintain and monitor drainage and flood control facilities, and prepare annual reports that describe the condition, maintenance performed, and required improvements of drainage and flood control facilities.									
<b>E. Hazardous Materials</b>										
Impact GSS-E1. Potential hazardous materials and methane off-gassing related to materials in the fill at the Corporation Yard could result in worker and/or resident exposure to hazardous materials or hazardous conditions.	—	—	—	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	GSS-E1. Conduct Phase II investigation consisting of subsurface soil borings and initiate remedial action if warranted at Corporation Yard. GSS-E2. Assess potential for methane off-gassing at the Corporation Yard fill area and incorporate methane controls and/or venting into construction plans and final design if warranted.									

Notes:

● = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.

○ = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Project Impact	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Alteration of Drainage Patterns</b>										
HYD-A1. The proposed project would result in the alteration of surface drainage patterns, but would not alter the course of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	HYD-A1. Ensure on-site detention of stormwater run-off at development sites and oil/grease separators at parking lots; prepare final drainage plan with flow calculations and construction detail, and implement approved drainage plan. HYD-A2. Maintain and monitor drainage and flood control facilities, and prepare annual reports that describe the condition, maintenance performed, and required improvements of drainage and flood control facilities.									
<b>B. Stormwater Run-off and Drainage Infrastructure</b>										
HYD-B1. The proposed project would result in increased stormwater run-off due to an increase in impervious surfaces and topographic alterations.	○	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	○	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	HYD-A1, HYD-A2. See above.									
<b>C. Water Quality</b>										
HYD-C1. The proposed project would degrade surface water quality due to an increase in sediment and pollutant loading in stormwater drainage during construction and from operation.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	HYD-A1, HYD-A2. See above. HYD-C1. Prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan to prevent and reduce sediments and contaminants in stormwater run-off during construction. HYD-C2. Provide regular inspection and maintenance of operational best management practices to ensure function and minimize the discharge of pollutants to surface water. GSS-C1. Prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan. GSS-D1. Dewater excavations and shore temporary cuts during construction of the underground facilities.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impact	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
HYD-C2. The proposed project could degrade water quality due to pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer use from the Pebble Beach Driving Range Relocation from Area V to Collins Field.	—	—	⊙	—	—	—	—	—	—	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	HYD-C3. Prepare and implement an integrated pest management program for the relocated Pebble Beach Driving Range.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.8 Land Use and Recreation

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Land Use Compatibility</b>										
LU-A1. The proposed project could introduce new land uses that could be incompatible with surrounding land uses or with the general character of the area.	○	○	○	○	○	⊙	○	○	—	—
Mitigation Measures:	AQ-E1. Prepare and implement a manure management plan.									
<b>B. Plan/Policy Consistency</b>										
LU-B1. While the project is inconsistent with the existing LCP, the proposed project is consistent with the proposed LCP Amendment which is consistent with the Coastal Act and which would need to be approved prior to any project approval.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									○
<b>C. Recreational Demand</b>										
LU-C1. The proposed project would add new recreation trails and would increase the use of existing parks and recreation facilities, but would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities not included in the proposed project that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	○	○	○	○	○	○	—	—	—	—
<b>D. Open Space Quality and Quantity</b>										
LU-D1. The proposed project would not diminish the quality and quantity of open space used for recreation	—	—	—	—	—	○	—	—	—	—

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.9 Noise

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Permanent Increase in Noise due to Project Operations</b>										
NOI-A1. The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the County's Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise chart from operation of ventilation fans for underground parking structure at The Lodge at Pebble Beach, but not from operation of other project elements.	⊙	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	⊙
Mitigation Measures:	NOI-A1. Employ noise-reducing treatments on parking structure fan systems.									
<b>B. Short-Term Noise Increases due to Construction</b>										
NOI-B1. The proposed project would result in exposure of outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses to construction noise greater than 85 dB at a distance of 50 feet during construction.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									⊙
Mitigation Measures:	NOI-B1. Limit hours of construction activities. NOI-B2. Locate equipment as far from noise-sensitive receptors as practicable. NOI-B3. Use sound-control devices on combustion-powered construction equipment. NOI-B4. Shield/shroud any impact tools used during construction. NOI-B5. Shut off machinery when not in use during construction. NOI-B6. Use shortest practicable traveling routes during construction. NOI-B7. Disseminate essential information to residences and implement a complaint response/tracking program during construction. NOI-B8. Implement additional mitigation measures, as needed, to reduce exposure of outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses to sustained construction noise levels greater than 85 dBA during construction.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project's Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>C. Construction-Related Vibration</b>										
NOI-C1. The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction at The Lodge at Pebble Beach and Area M Spyglass Hill Option 1 (New Resort Hotel).	⊙	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	—
Mitigation Measures:	NOI-C1. Limit construction activities that result in vibration to specified times, provide advance notice to adjacent residents of such schedules, and temporarily relocate residents if requested and if vibration testing demonstrates that levels exceed Federal Transit Administration vibration thresholds.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts



3.10 Public Services and Utilities

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Police and Fire Protection</b>										
PSU-A1. The proposed project would increase demand for fire and first-responder emergency medical services.	○	○	○	○	○	○	—	—	—	○
PSU-A2. The proposed project would increase demand for police services.	○	○	○	○	○	○	—	—	—	○
<b>B. Emergency Access</b>										
PSU-B1. The proposed project could interfere with emergency access routes to open space areas and an adopted emergency access plan during construction.	—	—	—	—	—	○	—	—	—	○
<b>C. Wildland Fire Hazard</b>										
PSU-C1. The proposed project could expose people and structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	◎ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									◎
Mitigation Measures:	PSU-C1. Implement vegetation management plans and maintenance in high-risk fire areas. PSU-C2. Implement fire safety precautions during the declared fire season when performing maintenance on natural open space areas. PSU-C3. Improve water flow requirements where needed to ensure proper fire flow.									
<b>D. Schools</b>										
PSU-D1. The proposed project could result in increased student enrollments.	—	—	—	—	○	○	—	—	—	○
<b>E. Wastewater Collection and Treatment</b>										
PSU-E1. The proposed project could result in increased wastewater treatment requirements.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									○
PSU-E2. The proposed project could increase need for sewer lines and wastewater treatment facility.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									○

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>F. Utility Disruption</b>										
PSU-F1. The proposed project could result in utility service disruptions during construction.	◎ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									◎
Mitigation Measures:	PSU-F1. Coordinate with the appropriate utility service providers and related agencies to reduce service interruptions prior to construction.									
<b>G. Solid Waste</b>										
PSU-G1. The proposed project would increase solid waste, green waste, and recycling disposal needs.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									○

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.11 Transportation

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Traffic during Project Construction</b>										
TRA-A1. Construction traffic would result in short-term increases in traffic volumes that would affect level of service and intersection operations.	● (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-A1. Schedule construction work and truck trips to comply with Del Monte Forest Architectural Board Guidelines. TRA-A2. Develop and implement a traffic control plan. TRA-A3. Obtain approval for construction truck traffic routes from Monterey County and include these routes in all contracts. TRA-A4. Implement SR 1/68/17-Mile Drive Intersection Reconstruction early in the overall construction schedule.									
<b>B. Del Monte Forest Gates</b>										
TRA-B1. The project would result in a minor increase in traffic at the Del Monte Forest gates.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									○
<b>C. Impacts to Roadway Intersections and Segments</b>										
TRA-C1. The proposed project would add substantial traffic to intersections in Del Monte Forest and the immediate vicinity to decrease from acceptable levels of service to unacceptable levels or to worsen existing unacceptable levels of service.	● (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-C1. Pay fair-share contribution to install a traffic signal at the intersection of SR 68/Skyline Forest Drive and widen SR 68 from two to four lanes through the intersection. TRA-C2. Pay fair-share contribution to construct the full SR 68 Widening Project. TRA-C3. Pay fair-share contribution to construct new turn lanes and establish new traffic signal timings at the SR 1/Ocean Avenue intersection. TRA-C6(C). Pay fair-share contribution to restripe the westbound approach at the Sunset Drive/Congress Avenue intersection to provide a left-turn pocket. TRA-C7(C). Pay fair-share contribution to optimize signal timings and phasing at the Forest Avenue/David Avenue intersection. TRA-C8(C). Pay fair-share contribution to construct the full SR 68 Widening Project (as required by TRA-C2) and to add third lane and to construct a third eastbound lane on SR 68 from east of the									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
	Carmel Hill Professional Center driveway through the SR 1 intersection, with one lane going to the SR 1 southbound on-ramp and two lanes proceeding across the SR 68 overcrossing. TRA-C9(C). Pay fair-share contribution to construct a refuge lane on SR 68 for traffic turning left out of the Aguajito Road intersection. TRA-C10(C). Pay fair-share contribution to optimize signal timings at the SR 1/Carpenter Street intersection.									
TRA-C2. The project would add traffic to regional highway sections that are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service.	● (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-C4. Pay fair-share traffic impact fee for various improvements to SR 1, SR 68, and SR 156 based on the conditions described in the Transportation Agency of Monterey County’s Regional Development Impact Fee Program.									
TRA-C3. The project would add traffic to a highway ramp projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service.	● (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-C5. Pay fair-share contribution to replace the SR 1 northbound merge at SR 68 (west) with an auxiliary lane between SR 68 (west) and Munras Avenue.									
<b>D. Access and Circulation</b>										
TRA-D1. The project would create new roadways that do not meet the design criteria established in the Del Monte Forest Transportation Policy Agreement, substantially increase hazards because of roadway design or internal circulation patterns, or result in inadequate emergency access.	◎ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-D1. Ensure compliance with the Del Monte Forest Transportation Policy Agreement. TRA-D2. Incorporate a 25-foot transition between all driveways and roadways that has no more than a 2% grade. TRA-D3. At The Lodge at Pebble Beach, add a crosswalk to address a pedestrian desire line (i.e., places pedestrians will walk) crossing the circulation road. TRA-D4. At The Lodge at Pebble Beach, modify the design of the two traffic circles to facilitate efficient vehicle flow. TRA-D5. At The Lodge at Pebble Beach, install yield signs to control the three-leg traffic circle while the other traffic circle should have no vehicle traffic controls.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
	TRA-D6. At The Lodge at Pebble Beach, add sidewalks or paths to serve pedestrian movements between the Fairway One Complex, Peter Hay Golf Course, and The Lodge at Pebble Beach. TRA-D7. At the Colton Building, improve sight distance at the intersection between the existing driveway and Cypress Drive. TRA-D8. At the Colton Building, install a warning sign or lights at the entry to the parking facility, or widen the opening to at least 22 feet. TRA-D9. At The Inn at Spanish Bay, modify the 17-Mile Drive/Congress Road intersection to an all-way stop-controlled intersection, installing stop signs at all approaches. TRA-D10. At the Pebble Beach Links Driving Range, add a pedestrian crosswalk that connects the driving range to the Peter Hay Golf Course.									
<b>E. Parking</b>										
TRA-E1. Project land uses would create a need for additional parking.	○	○	○	—	○	—	—	—	—	—
<b>F. Special Events</b>										
TRA-F1. The project could change traffic volumes at Del Monte Forest gates during special events.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
TRA-F2. The project could change traffic volumes on internal roads during special events.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
TRA-F3. The project could change parking conditions during special events.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
<b>G. Transit and Alternative Transportation</b>										
TRA-G1. The project would be inconsistent, in part, with Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan alternative transportation policies and Monterey County trip reduction requirements.	⊙ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-G1. Prepare and implement an alternative transportation plan, emphasizing specific trip reduction measures for proposed visitor, resident, and employee uses. TRA-G2. Expand the existing shuttle and valet system to incorporate the Spyglass Hotel as part of the overall parking management system (Option 1 only).									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ⊙ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>H. Bicycles and Trails</b>										
TRA-H1. The project would introduce additional traffic along 17-Mile Drive between Spanish Bay Drive and the Pacific Grove Gate, which could compromise the effectiveness of existing bicycle signage.	◎ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—
Mitigation Measures:	TRA-H1. Stencil "Route" after the bicycle symbols on the designated route for bicycling between the Pacific Grove Gate and Stevenson Drive at Ondulado Road.									
TRA-H2. The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting trails.	○ (Applies to proposed project as a whole)									—

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. — = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

3.12 Water Supply and Demand

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF	
				MH	MR					
<b>A. Water Supply and Demand</b>										
WSD-A1. The project's water demand would represent an increase in water use above the 2011 Existing Conditions, but would be within the Applicant's current entitlement and could be legally supplied by Cal-Am through 2016. However, given the current uncertain nature of regional water supplies, the additional project water demand could intensify water supply shortfalls and rationing starting in 2017, if the Regional Project (or its equivalent) is not built by then.	● (Applies to project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation is not feasible because any additional mitigation would be disproportionate to the impact of proposed project given Applicant's prior financing of the Recycled Water Project. The Applicant's use of water for this project is pursuant to a valid, legal water entitlement affirmed by MPWMD, Cal-Am, and SWRCB.									
<b>B. Water Infrastructure Capacity</b>										
WSD-B1. Local water infrastructure is included to serve the proposed project, and existing supply infrastructure outside the project area is adequate to serve the project through 2016. The Regional Project (or its equivalent) will need to be built by 2017 to serve existing demand and the increase in demand from the project; regional water supply infrastructure and operations will have secondary environmental impacts.	● (Applies to project as a whole)									●
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation is not feasible because any additional mitigation would be disproportionate to the impact of proposed project given Applicant's prior financing of the infrastructure for the Recycled Water Project. The Applicant's use of water for this project is pursuant to a valid, legal water entitlement affirmed by MPWMD, Cal-Am, and SWRCB.									

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. -- = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project's Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

Project Impacts	Project Elements									Cumulative	
	PBL	SBI	COL-EQC	Area M		RES SUB	RD	TRA	INF		
				MH	MR						
<b>C. Carmel River Biological Resources</b>											
WSD-C1. The project's water demand would result in increased withdrawals from the Carmel River through 2016 and thus would have a significant and unavoidable impact on Carmel River biological resources. After 2017, SWRCB mandated reductions in Cal-Am withdrawals from the Carmel River will not be changed by the project demand.											●
											●

●  
(Applies to project as a whole)

Notes:

- = Significant unavoidable impact. ◎ = Significant impact that can be reduced to less than significant.
- = Less-than-significant impact. – = No impact or not applicable to the development site.

**PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SBI** – The Inn at Spanish Bay; **COL-EQC** – Collins Field–Equestrian Center–Special Events Area; **MH** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Resort Hotel (Option 1); **MR** – Area M Spyglass Hill—New Residential Lots (Option 2); **RES SUB** – Residential Lot Subdivisions; **RD** – Roadway Improvements; **TRA** – Trail Improvements; **INF** – Infrastructure Improvements; **Cumulative** – Proposed Project’s Contribution to Cumulative Impacts