

Exhibit H

This page intentionally left blank.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION**FILED**

OCT 15 1999

JOSEPH E. PITTA
MONTEREY COUNTY CLERK
Karvel Stahl DEPUTY

Project Title: PEBBLE BEACH CO
File Number: PLN990305
Owner: PEBBLE BEACH CO
P O BOX 1767
PEBBLE BEACH CA 93953
ATTN CHERYL BURRELL

Project Location: 1576 CYPRESS DR PEBBLE BEACH
Primary APN: 008-411-020-000
Project Planner: Wanda Hickman
Permit Type: Combined Development Permit

Project Description: Combined Development Permit which includes: a Coastal Administrative Permit, Design Approval and General Development Plan to allow for a remodel and addition to the Beach and Tennis Club and the removal of three trees. The site is located westerly of Cypress Drive, at 1576 Cypress Drive (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 008-411-019-000 and 008-411-020-000), Del Monte Forest Area, Coastal Zone.

THIS PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AS IT HAS BEEN FOUND:

- a) That said project will not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment.
- b) That said project will have no significant impact on long-term environmental goals.
- c) That said project will have no significant cumulative effect upon the environment.
- d) That said project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Decision Making Body (check one):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Administrator | <input type="checkbox"/> Chief of Planning Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Supervisors | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Responsible Agency: County of Monterey
Review Period Begins: 10/18/1999
Review Period Ends: 11/17/1999

For further information, including a copy of the application and Initial Study are available at the Monterey County Planning & Building Inspection Department, Monterey County Courthouse, 240 Church St., Salinas, CA (831) 755-5025

POSTED TO DATE

MONTEREY COUNTY

PLANNING & BUILDING INSPECTION DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 1208 SALINAS, CA 93902
PHONE: (831) 755-5025 FAX: (831) 755-5487



INITIAL STUDY

*Combined Development Permit File #: PLN 990305
Coastal Development Permit, Design Approval & General Development Permit*

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title: Pebble Beach Company Beach & Tennis Club

File No.: PLN990305

Project Location: The property is located fronting the Pacific Ocean at Stillwater Cove in Pebble Beach within the Del Monte Forest area of the Coastal Zone, approximately one mile north of the City of Carmel.

Name of Property Owner: Pebble Beach Company

Name of Applicant: Pebble Beach Company

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 008-411-019-000 and 008-411-020-000

Acreage of Property: 14.4 acres

General Plan Designation: Open Space- Recreation

Zoning District: OR (CZ)

Lead Agency: Monterey County Planning & Building Inspection

Prepared By: Wanda Hickman, Associate Planner

Date Prepared: October 14, 1999

Contact Person: Wanda Hickman

Phone Number: Phone 831-755-531 Fax: 831-759-9620
E-mail: hickmanw@co.monterey.ca.us

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Project Description:

The proposed project consists of expanding and renovating the Pebble Beach Beach and Tennis Club. Fitness and cardiovascular facilities are to be improved and will include partial demolition and renovation of existing storage area and partial second floor addition. The 4,019 square foot expansion and renovation will increase the building area to a total of 19,692 square feet. The addition/renovation requires the removal of three Monterey Cypresses. The applicant is requesting a Combined Development Permit (PLN990305) that includes a Coastal Development Permit, Design Approval and General Development Permit. The Coastal Development Permit is required for the expansion and remodel within the Coastal Zone, per California statutes. The Design Approval is required to ensure consistency in architectural design, per the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance, Title 20. The General Development Permit addresses the long range development, operation of the facilities including physical expansion and circulation or transportation improvements.

The property is located fronting the Pacific Ocean at Stillwater Cove in Pebble Beach, within the Del Monte Forest area of the Coastal Zone, approximately one mile north of the City of Carmel. Access is provided by Cypress Drive via 17-mile drive.

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

Regional Setting

The Del Monte Forest area on the Monterey Peninsula is a spectacular meeting of forest, land and sea. It contains vital habitat for a variety of vegetation and wildlife. The remaining unspoiled forests and scenic resources consists of low rolling hills with numerous small canyons and valleys covered by grasses, maritime chaparral, and Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress tree stands. The Pebble Beach area is a series of unincorporated subdivisions and is characterized by single-family homes, open space and golf courses. The area is in the Coastal Zone as defined by the California Coastal Commission, and is subject to the regulations of the Certified Local Coastal Program.

Site Specifics

The Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan designates this site and adjacent properties as Open Space-Recreation "OR" (CZ). OR (CZ) is the zoning designations for this site and adjacent parcels, except along the Ocean which is Resource Conservation "RC" (CZ). The golf course, open space and the Pacific Ocean are adjacent to the proposed project. The area of the site is 14.4 acres and is occupied by the current Beach and Tennis Club, parking and golf course facilities. It is irregular in shape and relatively flat except the six to ten foot bluff by the beach area. The Beach Club parcel is a landscaped developed parcel. Non-native Monterey Cypress can be found throughout the site.

Services

Monterey County Police Department and Cypress/CDF Fire Protection District will service the proposed project. Potable water will be provided by California-American Water Company, as approved by Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, and Pebble Beach Community Services District provides sewage disposal.

III. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

General Plan/Area Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality Mgmt. Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality Control Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Coastal Program-LUP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality Management Plan

Consistency of a project with the regional population and employment forecast will result in consistency of the project with the Air Quality Management Plan. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District incorporates the County's Local Coastal Program/ General Plan in its preparation of regional air quality plans, making this project consistent with the applicable Air Quality Plan. However, section VI, 3 (Air Quality) below discusses whether a particular project conflicts or obstructs implementation of air quality plans, violates any standard or contributes to air quality violations, results in cumulative non-attainment ambient air quality standard, expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors affecting many people.

General Plan/ Local Coastal Program (LCP)-Land Use Plan

Section VI, 9 (Land Use and Planning) below discusses whether a particular project physically divides an established community, conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project or conflicts with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Section VI, below, assesses the project's consistency with applicable policies of the LCP and General Plan.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

A. FACTORS

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | | |

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

☐ Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: The project involves expanding and renovating the Pebble Beach Beach and Tennis Club. The 4,019 square feet expansion will increase the building area to a total of 19,692 square feet. The proposed development will occur in an existing developed area with no potential significant adverse impacts. Overall, the proposed project conforms to the policies and ordinances of the County's Local Coastal Program.

Agricultural Resources:

The proposed expansion and renovation is not located in prime farmland area or designated for agriculture use.

Land Use:

The proposed development is consistent with the Del Monte Forest Land Use Policies and the development standards of the Coastal Implementation Plan.

Mineral Resources:

This proposal includes development within an existing developed area. No grading or clearing is required for this proposal.

Noise:

This site is not identified by any federal, state or local policies or plans as an area of high noise sensitivity. The proposed use will not create noise levels greater than the LCP'S maximum criteria for ambient noise levels. The project as proposed would not significantly increase noise levels. Noise generated due to construction activities will be short-term and are not considered to be significant.

Population and Housing:

The project would not significantly alter the location, distribution or density of human population in the area, or create a demand for additional housing.

Public Services and Recreation:

The project was reviewed by Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, Cypress Fire Protection District, and the Monterey County Departments of Public Works, Environmental Health, and Parks. The proposed project was deemed complete by the various County agencies. The Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan does not include policies or plans identifying the proposed use as potentially significant on public services and recreation.

Utilities:

Monterey County Sheriff Department and Cypress/CDF Fire Protection District will service the proposed project. Potable water will be provided by California-American Water Company, as approved by Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, and Pebble Beach Community Services District provide sewage disposal. Utilities currently serve the property.

B. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


Signature

Wanda A. Hickman
Printed Name

10-14-99
Date

Associate Planner, Coastal Program
Title

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or

more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project consists of expanding and renovating the Pebble Beach Beach and Tennis Club. Fitness and cardiovascular facilities are to be improved and will include partial demolition and renovation of existing storage area and partial second floor addition. The 4,019 square feet expansion and renovation will increase the building area to a total of 19,692 square feet. Though the project will be visible from adjacent uses and from Point Lobos Reserve, only minimal visual impacts are expected to occur on scenic vistas and visual resources. The project will be required to comply with landscaping and lighting requirements and architectural design standards. As a condition of approval lighting is required to be unobtrusive, harmonious with the local area and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled.

Mitigation:

- As a condition of approval exterior lighting shall be required to be unobtrusive, harmonious with the local area and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section IV: Environmental Factors

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The California Clean Air Act identifies the North Central Coast Air Basin as a moderate non-attainment area for the State ozone standard and a non-attainment area for the State PM10 standard. Air quality standards are applied equally, however, the location where measuring similar conditions to assess impacts may be several miles away. Ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM10) are pollutants of the Basin. Ozone is a seasonal problem from April to October and is considered a secondary pollutant. PM10 is comprised of small, suspended particulate matter measuring less than 10 microns in diameter. It is a chemical breakdown and is usually in the form of dust, nitrates and sulfates. MBUAPCD has determined that a construction of the site and operation of the proposed facility could result the generation of Ozone and PM10 which may exceed State standards. As a standard condition of approval, the project will be required to comply with dust control measures during the construction process. Project construction impacts upon air quality are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation:

2. As a standard condition of approval, the project shall be required to comply with dust control measures during the construction process.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The subject property is developed and landscaped. Development consists of the Beach and Tennis Club, parking and golf course facilities. It is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. Non-native vegetation predominate the site. Three non-native Monterey Cypress will be removed. Since the Cypress trees to be removed were determined to be diseased or unhealthful, replacement is not required.

Mitigation:

- Landscaping of the site shall consist of drought tolerant native plants.

4. Trees located within the construction zone shall be protected from accidental damage during construction by wrapping trunks with protective materials. Measures shall include avoiding fill of any type against the base of the trunks and avoiding an increase in soil depth at the feeding zone or drip line of the retained trees.
5. Fencing shall be required to ensure construction activities do not impact ocean habitat.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The applicant provided a Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance, prepared by Archaeological Consulting, dated November 19, 1985. The Archaeological Consultant provided a letter, dated July 22, 1999 verifying its conclusions of the site reconnaissance performed in 1985. The general surface reconnaissance performed included visual survey and the use of a four inch bucket auger to examine subsurface soils. Background research indicated the presence of previously recorded archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of the site. (Under the current Beach Club and about 75 to 100 meters to the east. Prehistoric resources and at least one human burial was reported on site.

The recommended mitigation that an archaeological monitor be present on site during ground disturbing activities will be incorporated as a condition of project approval. Therefore, the potential impacts to cultural resources shall be mitigated to a less than significant impact.

Mitigation:

6. Prior to issuance of a grading and/or building permits, the applicant shall hire an archaeological monitor to be on-site during any ground disturbing activities for the proposed residence, guesthouse, parking area and retaining walls. Ground disturbing activities shall including foundation removal during demolition, trenching, grading and construction of new foundation. Review and approval of said contract between the applicant and archaeological monitor shall be provided to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection.

7. If during the course of future development activity on the subject property, cultural, archaeological, historical, paleontological resources are uncovered at the site (surface or subsurface resources) work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (150 feet) of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. The Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Society of Professional Archaeologist) shall be immediately contacted by the responsible individual present on-site. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

According to the Del Monte Forest LUP Seismic Hazards Map the project is located within a high seismic hazard area. Seismic effects such as surface ground rupture, seismically induced ground shaking or failure has a high probability of affecting the project site. The applicant states that the site is more than an 1/8 of a mile from the nearest Fault line and is not subject to preparing a Geotechnical Report. Due to the relatively small scale, location and nature of the project and since structures currently occupy the area where the project is to be sited, potential impacts were determined to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

Mitigation:

8. All development shall comply with the seismic design standards of the Uniform Building Code.
9. Erosion control shall be incorporated into a final drainage plan prepared for and approved by the County Water Resources Agency.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section IV: Environmental Factors

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

It is anticipated that the project will minimally alter existing drainage patterns. The applicant shall submit engineered plans for the, surface drainage and sub-surface drainage improvements for review and approval of the Director of Environmental Health. In addition, the applicant shall comply with all required local, State and Federal permits.

Mitigation:

10. The applicant shall submit engineered plans for the, surface drainage and sub-surface drainage improvements for review and approval of the Director of Water Resources Agency and Planning & Building Insp.. In addition, the applicant shall comply with all required local, State and Federal permits.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

10. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

11. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

14. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting and Section 4: Environmental Factors

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:

1. A traffic analysis was performed by Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc. It determined that traffic generated by the project would be minimal and no adverse impacts would occur on the transportation system.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:

The project is consistent with the with the LCP/ General Plan and AMBAG'S regional population and employment forecast and therefore, is consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Plan. The Regional Water Quality Control Board incorporates the County's Local Coastal Program/ General Plan in its preparation of regional water quality plans, making this project consistent with the regional water quality plans.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 2: Project Description & Environmental Setting, Section 4: Environmental Factors and Section 6: Environmental Checklist.

VIII. FISH AND GAME ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FEES

Assessment of Fee:

For purposes of implementing Section 735.5 of Title 14, California Code of Regulations: If based on the record as a whole, the Planner determines that implementation of the project described herein, will result in changes to resources A-G listed below, then a **Fish and Game Document Filing Fee** must be assessed. Based upon analysis using the criteria A-G, and information contained in the record, state conclusions with evidence below.

- A) Riparian land, rivers, streams, water courses, and wetlands under state and federal jurisdiction.
- B) Native and non-native plant life and the soil required to sustain habitat for fish and wildlife;
- C) Rare and unique plant life and ecological communities dependent on plant life, and;
- D) Listed threatened and endangered plant and animals and the habitat in which they are believed to reside.
- E) All species of plant or animals listed as protected or identified for special management in the Fish and Game Code, the Public Resources Code, and the Water Code, or regulations adopted thereunder.
- F) All marine terrestrial species subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game and the ecological communities in which they reside.
- G) All air and water resources the degradation of which will individually or cumulatively result in the loss of biological diversity among plants and animals residing in air or water.

De minimis Fee Exemption: For purposes of implementing Section 735.5 of the California Code of Regulations: A *De Minimis Exemption* may be granted to the **Environmental Document Fee** if there is substantial evidence, based on the record as a whole, that there **will not** be changes to the above named resources V. A-G caused by implementation of the project. Using the above criteria, state conclusions with evidence below, and follow Planning and Building Inceptions Department Procedures for filing a de minimis exemption.

Conclusion: The project will not be required to pay the fee.

Evidence: The project will not result in impacts to listed threatened and endangered plant and animals and the habitat in which they are believed to reside. The site is developed and landscaped and the proposed development will replace an existing structure.

IX. REFERENCES

1. Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan (Part 5), County of Monterey Local Coastal Program
 2. Monterey County Zoning Ordinance- (Part 1)
-
3. Monterey County and California CEQA Guidelines
 4. Combined Development Permit Project File No. 990305

X. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment "A"	Vicinity Map, Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations
Attachment "B"	Pebble Beach, Project Description
Attachment "C"	Cultural Resources Addendum Letter, 7-22-99 and Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance, 11-15-99, Archaeological Consulting, Professional Archaeologists
Attachment "D"	Forest Management Plan, August 1999, Steven Staub, Forester
Attachment "E"	Traffic Assessment Letter, 9-7-99, Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc.
Attachment "F"	Pebble Beach Company- Coastal Access Plan
Attachment "G"	Potable Water and Wastewater/ Sewage Disposal and Fire Protection "Will Serve" Letters

This page intentionally left blank