

Summary for Electronic Document Submittal

Lead agencies may include 15 copies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH# 2006081150

Project Title: Rancho Canada Village Subdivision Project

Lead Agency: County of Monterey Resource Management Agency-Planning (RMA)

Contact Name: Carl P. Holm, AICP, RMA Director

Email: holmcp@co.monterey.ca.us Phone Number: (831)755-5025

Project Location: Carmel Valley Monterey
City County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

In 2016, the County of Monterey Board of Supervisors certified an EIR and approved the Rancho Cañada Village Subdivision Project. The County has prepared this Second Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report in response to a July 2018 Judgment and Peremptory Writ issued by the Monterey Superior Court in litigation entitled, *Carmel Valley Association, Inc., v. County of Monterey* (Case No. 17CV000131). This SRDEIR represents a limited revision to the 2016 Rancho Cañada Village Subdivision project EIR certified by the Board of Supervisors to render that document compliant with the Superior Court's ruling.

The Proposed Project, PLN040061-AMD1, would develop an approximately 76-acre area within the former West Course at Rancho Cañada Golf Club with a mix of residential and recreational uses. The Project site would be comprised of approximately 130-unit residential units on 25 acres; 40 acres of permanent open space; and 11 acres of common areas (amenities and infrastructure). The Project is proposed as a planned unit development (PUD) providing a compact, pedestrian-friendly development with a variety of housing types and recreational uses within the residential community. The elements of the design include a mix of smart growth and traditional neighborhood elements that involve the incorporation of established shopping facilities, schools, open space, and churches. The Project would also include an extension of Rio Road through a network of local neighborhood streets to allow safe ingress and egress for residents and the public through Rio Road west. Entitlements include amending the Carmel Valley Master Plan (part of the 2010 General Plan), rezoning from Public/Quasi-Public to Medium Density Residential, Vesting Tentative Standard Subdivision, and Use Permits (development in the floodplain, tree removal).

The Proposed Project is located at the mouth of Carmel Valley along Carmel Valley Road, east of the intersection of Carmel Valley Road and State Route 1 in unincorporated Carmel Valley, Monterey County, California. (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 015-162-016-000, 015-162-017-000, 015-162-025-000, 015-162-026-000, 015-162-039-000; a portion of 015-162-040-000; and portions of 015-021-006-000, 015-021-007-000, and 015-541-091-000).

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Potentially significant effects are anticipated Geology and Soils, Hydrology, Biological Resources, Aesthetics, Land Use, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation, Cultural Resources,

and Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Analysis has identified the project's significant or potentially significant effects and proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid the effects; they are briefly described in the attached three pages.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as required by Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, would describe how each of the mitigation measures will be implemented and provides a mechanism for monitoring and/or reporting on their implementation to ensure compliance with environmental mitigation during project implementation and operation. A monitoring program will be included in the FEIR.

If the lead agency approves the project with associated significant effects on the environment that cannot be feasibly avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels, the County may deny the project. If it does not deny the project, the County must also adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explain the benefits that outweigh the significant unavoidable environmental effects, in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Some controversy is known to Monterey County staff. The project has a history of litigation, following publication of the 2008 Draft EIR and 2016 Revised Draft EIR. This Second Revised Draft EIR was prepared in compliance with the Court's CEQA rulings, although appeals and cross-appeals are still pending in the Court of Appeal. Another area of public controversy is the amount of affordable housing included with this Project.

Provide a list of responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

1. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
2. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
3. Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD)
4. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
5. County of Monterey
6. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD)
7. Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (Monterey County LAFCO)
8. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
9. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)
10. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS)

Additional Information for box 2 (briefly describing proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid the project's significant or potentially significant effects).

Geology and Soils

- Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require all structure be designed in accordance with the current California Building Code and recommendations in site-specific geologic and geotechnical reports to reduce seismic hazard, expansive soil, and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would implement recommended grading and slope design criteria of the site-specific geotechnical reports to reduce landslide and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would require preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan to reduce erosion and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure GEO-4 would remove localized zones of overly loose materials to reduce expansive soil and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.

Hydrology

- Mitigation Measure HYD-1, HYD-2, and HYD-3 require a stormwater control plan, operation and maintenance plan for stormwater control measures, and maintenance agreement for stormwater control measures to reduce drainage, stormwater runoff, water quality, and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure HYD-4 and HYD-5 require a spill prevention and control program and measures to maintain surface water or groundwater quality to reduce water quality and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure HYD-6 would protect the eastern slope of the excavated basin to reduce flooding and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.

Biological Resources

- Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 would provide funding assurances and reporting concerning restoration progress and success, restore riparian forest/woodland concurrent with impact to compensate for the permanent loss of riparian forest habitat, minimize disturbance of riparian forest and woodland, and conduct mandatory contractor/worker awareness training for construction personnel to reduce vegetation impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would restore or create wetland and pond habitat to mitigate permanent loss of waters of the united states and state to reduce wetland impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would compensate for the removal of protected trees to reduce tree loss impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measures BIO-7 through BIO-11 would conduct formal site assessment and consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine if protocol-level surveys are necessary or assume CRLF presence, restrict filling of ponds/wetlands and initial ground-disturbing activities in CRLF habitat to the dry season, conduct a preconstruction survey for CRLF, monitor initial ground-disturbing construction activities within CRLF habitat, and compensate for the removal and disturbance of CRLF breeding habitat to reduce CRLF impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-12 would conduct a preconstruction survey for southwestern pond turtles and monitor construction activities within suitable aquatic habitat to reduce impacts to southwestern pond turtles to less than significant.

- Mitigation Measures BIO-13 and BIO-14 would conduct surveys for nesting tricolored blackbirds and incorporate tricolored blackbird nesting habitat into the newly developed project restoration plans to reduce tricolored blackbird impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-15 would conduct surveys for woodrat middens and relocate woodrats and middens prior to construction activity to reduce Monterey dusky-footed woodrat impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-16 would remove vegetation during the nonbreeding season and avoid disturbance of nesting migratory birds and raptors to reduce nesting bird impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-17 would conduct a survey for suitable roosting habitat and evidence of roosting bats and avoid disturbing them to reduce bat impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-18 would rescue steelhead to reduce fish impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure BIO-19 would install signs along and within the habitat preserve about restraining dogs and encouraging cats to be kept inside to reduce wildlife impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-19 would also reduce cumulative biological resource impacts to less than cumulatively considerable.

Aesthetics

- Mitigation Measure AES-1 would implement measures to reduce light and glare, and visual intrusion to surrounding land uses and other public viewpoints to reduce visual quality, light and glare, and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.

Land Use

- Mitigation Measure AES-1 (described above) would reduce land use compatibility impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure TR-1 (described below) would reduce conflicts with land use plans, policies and regulations, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
- Cumulative land use impacts have no available mitigation measures and would be cumulative and unavoidable.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 would follow Cypress Fire Protection District and other guidelines for storage and handling of hazardous materials, immediately contain spills, excavate spill-contaminated soil, and disposal at an approved facility, and develop and implement plans to reduce exposure of people and the environment to hazardous conditions during construction activities to reduce potential impacts from upset and accident conditions to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 would require the project to participate in the local household hazardous waste collection program to reduce hazardous materials transport, use, and disposal to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4 would also reduce cumulative hazardous materials impacts to less than cumulatively considerable.

Transportation and Circulation

- Mitigation Measure TR-1 would contribute fair-share to interchange improvements of Laureless Grande and Carmel Valley Road through the CVTIP traffic impact fee to reduce unsignalized intersection impacts; however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

- Impacts from peak hour segment LOS decreases on SR-1 would be significant and unavoidable with no feasible mitigation available.
- Mitigation Measure TR-2 would require a construction traffic control plan to reduce construction traffic impacts; however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
- Cumulative traffic impacts would remain cumulative and unavoidable despite implementation of Mitigation Measures TR-1 and TR-2.

Air Quality

- Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would prohibit wood-burning fireplaces to reduce long-term emission impacts to less than significant.

Noise

- Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would implement noise-reducing treatments at residences located near the batting practice area to reduce long-term noise impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would employ noise-reducing construction practices to reduce short-term noise impacts to less than significant.

Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation

- Mitigation Measure PSU-1 would dedicate water rights for the project; design for, meter, and monitor water to meet water budgets; and implement remedial action if water budgets exceeded to reduce water demand impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure PSU-2 test well supply, identify water treatment and distribution facilities, and avoid impacts on biological resources to reduce infrastructure capacity and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.
- Mitigation Measure PSU-3 coordinate with appropriate utility service providers and related agencies to reduce service interruptions to reduce utility disruption and cumulative impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.

Cultural Resources

- Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-4 would stop work if buried cultural deposits, human remains, or vertebrate remains are encountered and require archaeological monitoring during ground disturbing activities to reduce archaeological resource, human remains, and paleontological resource impacts to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measure CR-5 would require consultation with a qualified archaeologist to identify resources and assess impacts to reduce impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant.
- Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-5 would also reduce cumulative cultural resource impacts to less than cumulatively considerable.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

- Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and Mitigation Measure GHG-2 would implement best management practices during construction and reduce annual GHG emission below the efficiency threshold through design features, replanting, and/or offset purchases, reducing impacts to less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable.