Chapter 3

Revisions to the Draft EIR and the Partial Revision of the Draft EIR

Introduction

This chapter contains revisions to the Draft EIR (DEIR) and the Partial Revision of the Draft EIR (PRDEIR) where identified as necessary pursuant to review of comment. The rationale for why these changes are necessary is discussed in the Master Responses in Chapter 2 and the individual responses in Chapters 5 and 6.

Revisions to the Draft EIR

Executive Summary

Revisions to the DEIR Executive Summary are shown in the Executive Summary of this document.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

No revisions made.

Chapter 2 – Project Description

Page 2.0-1, lines 16-18 are revised as follows:

The offices of the Pebble Beach Company (PBC), the Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD), the Del Monte Forest Foundation (DMFF), the Del Monte Forest Property Owners (DMFPO) and local offices of the California Department of Forestry (CDF) are also located within the Del Monte Forest

Table 2.0-1 following page 2.0-1, revised re: parcel numbers (see revised table)

Revised Table 2.0-1. Proposed Project Area Assessor Parcel Numbers

Project Area	Assessor Parcel Numbers
Proposed Golf Course (MNOUV)	008-241-008
	008-242-007
	008-272-010
	008-272-011
	008-311-011
	008-312-002
	008-313-002
	008-313-003
	008-321-006
	008-321-007
	008-321-008
	008-321-009
New Equestrian Center (Sawmill Site)	008-041-009
Spanish Bay Resort	007-091-028
Spanish Bay Driving Range	007-101-041
Spanish Bay Employee Housing	007-101-041
Pebble Beach Lodge	008-423-019
	008-423-029
	008-423-030
	008-423-031
	008-431-009
Residential and Open Space Uses	
Area F-2	008-032-004
Area F-3	008-032-006
Area G	008-041-009
Area H	008-031-015
	008-034-001
Area I-1	008-031-017
Area I-2	008-031-014
Area J	008-561-020
	008-022-024
	008-022-035
Area K	008-022-031
	008-021-009
	008-022-032
~~Open Space Parcel~~	~~008-561-020~~
Area L	008-031-008
Area PQR	008-163-001
	008-163-003
	008-163-005
	008-164-001
	008-171-009
	008-171-022
Corporation Yard Housing	008-041-009

Note: Proposed Project areas are contained within the listed parcels but do not necessarily include the entire parcel.

Page 2.0-3 Lines 33 to 34 are revised as follows:

Recreation Trails. Relocation of existing trail segments and construction of new trail segments, for a net increase of 2.4 miles ~~3.6 miles~~ of new trails.

Page 2.0-4 lines 1 through 4 are revised as follows:

Preservation Areas. These areas (436 acres) are separate from development and would be managed exclusively for natural resources. These areas will be dedicated ~~will be~~ by recordation of conservation easements to be held by the Del Monte Forest Foundation (DMFF) or an equivalent organization.

Page 2.0-5 Lines 16 to 21 are revised as follows:

Driving Range. Improvement of the existing driving range would be accomplished by lengthening and widening the practice fairway, creating a second tee-box area, constructing a range operations building with public restrooms, and developing a small parking area. Access would be from Ondulado Road at Stevenson Drive (Figure 2.0-6). One unisex public restroom is proposed. ~~Two on course public restrooms are proposed.~~

The following text is added to Page 2.0-7 after Line 17:

Special events at the existing Equestrian Center typically occur from March through November with competitions ranging from 1 to 12 days, including 2 to 3 days of exhibitor arrival. The largest of these events is the Pebble Beach Equestrian Classics occurring during July/August. This event includes an estimated 40 to 60 horse transports and between 300 and 400 vehicles traveling to and from the Equestrian Center. The project application does not include any proposal for new special events. The existing special events at the equestrian center would be relocated to the New Equestrian Center, but this would not increase the number nor change the character of expected special events.

Page 2.0-8 Lines 12 to 18 are revised as follows:

Tennis Facilities. Remodel of the existing golf clubhouse would add 1,800 sf of locker space and a children's pool would be added. ~~of the existing tennis clubhouse would add 1,800 sf of locker space.~~ The existing eight tennis courts and pro shop would be replaced by eight new courts and one half-court, constructed over the new underground parking garage.

Page 2.0-8 Lines 33 to 36 are revised as follows:

Driving Range. Development includes construction of a golf driving range (approximately 17 acres on a 29-acre site), a golf teaching facility (approximately 3,000 sf), and 2 surface parking lots with 204 spaces at the driving range and 97 spaces at the golf teaching facility. ~~a 301-space surface parking lot.~~

Page 2.0-9 Lines 8 to 16 are revised as follows:

Spanish Bay Employee Housing (12 units). Construction of 12 employee housing units is proposed to be located on a site of approximately 4 acres within a larger parcel in Area B near the Spanish Bay Resort. The housing units would be constructed as four two-story buildings. Two of the buildings would be three-bedroom duplexes, and the other two buildings would each contain four units consisting of five 2-bedroom units and seven 3-bedroom units in four buildings. ~~two two-bedroom units and two three-bedroom units.~~ Covered parking would be provided with each unit. Uncovered additional and guest parking would also be provided. Access to the site would be from Congress Road.

Page 2.0-13 Lines 38 to 41 are revised as follows:

According to information provided in the application, there are approximately 29 miles of existing hiking and equestrian trails within the project area. The Proposed Project would add 2.4 miles of trails, for a total of 31.4 miles. ~~Project would add 3.6 miles of trails, for a total of 32.5 miles.~~ Some of the existing trails would be relocated as part of site development.

Page 2.0-17 Lines 18 to 21 are revised as follows

The applicant proposes to dedicate three ~~the following~~ areas as "conservation areas," but this document uses a different definition than the applicant, and thus these areas have been reclassified as "resource management areas" for the purposes of this document. The applicant proposes to manage these areas along with the preservation and conservation areas as described in the following section. These resource management areas are:

Table 2.03 following page 2.0-17 is revised as follows (see enclosed revised table).

Corporation Yard Preservation Area changed to 6.5 acres in Table 2.0-3 and totals adjusted accordingly.

Page 2.0-20 Line 17 through 18 are revised as follows

The specific permit conditions are presented and discussed in Chapter 3.1, "Land Use."~~3.2, "Consistency with Plans and Policies.":~~

Table 2.0-4 on Page 2.0-21 is revised as follows (see enclosed revised table).

Coast Live Oak numbers were added; totals already included these trees.

Table 2.0-6 following page 2.0-23 is revised as follows (see enclosed revised table).

Clarifications are made as noted in the table.

Revised Table 2.0-3. Proposed Dedication Areas and Other Resource Management Areas

Area	Current LUP Designation	LUP Designation with Measure A	New Dedication Area (acres)
	Preservation Areas		
Preservation Area B	MDR/2, OF	OF	20.3
Preservation Area D	MDR/4	MDR/4	17.1
Preservation Area G	MDR/4, OF	OF	47.9
Preservation Area H	MDR/4, OF	OF	53.8
Preservation Area I-1	LDR/1, MDR/2, OF	OF	38.2
Preservation Area J	MDR/2	OF	0.8
Preservation Area L	MDR/2	OF	18.2
Preservation Area PQR	LDR/1, OF	OF	233.1
Corporation Yard Preservation Area	CGC	CGC	6.5 ~~6.9~~
		Subtotal	**435.8** ~~**436.2**~~
	Conservation Areas		
Proposed Golf Course Conservation Areas (Signal Hill and Bristol Curve)	MDR/2, OF	OR	39.9
Conservation Area C	MDR/2	OR	3.3
Conservation Area F-3	MDR/2	LDR/4	8.6
Conservation Area K	MDR/2	OR	3.9
		Subtotal	**55.8**
	Total Proposed Dedication of Preservation and Conservation Areas		**491.6** ~~**492.0**~~
	Other Resource Management Areas		
Proposed Golf Course Resource Management Areas (Wetlands/buffer and Pacific grove clover area)	LDR/1, OR	OR	21.7
Spanish Bay Employee Housing (forest)	MDR//2	MDR/2	1.9
Spanish Bay Driving Range scenic buffer (forest)	MDR/2	OR	4.1
Residential Area F-2 (forest)	MDR/2	LDR/1.5	0.5
Residential Area I-2 (forest)	MDR/2	LDR/1.5	4.1
	Total Other Resource Management Areas		**32.3**

Note: LDR/# = low-density residential/density of lots per acre; MDR/# = medium-density residential/density of lots per acre; VSC = visitor-serving commercial; CGC = coastal general commercial; OR = open space recreation; OSF = open space forest

Note: The applicant also proposes to dedicate wetland and retained forest areas at the New Equestrian Center totaling 22.1 acres; however these areas are already dedicated to either Monterey County or the Del Monte Forest Foundation and thus the proposed dedication does not represent a change from existing conditions.

Revised Table 2.0-4. Summary of Tree Removal and Grading

Project Site[1]	Grading (cubic yards)		Tree Removal			
	Cut	Fill	Monterey Pines <12 inches	Monterey Pines >12 inches	Coast Live Oak <12 inches	Coast Live Oak >12 inches
Proposed Golf Course[2]	318,000	377,000	5,034	4,548	439	62
New Equestrian Center[3]	26,850	41,354	1,490	423	475	10
Inn at Spanish Bay	44,252	0	22	30	0	0
Spanish Bay Driving Range	12,293	31,977	407	1,017	321	237
Spanish Bay Employee Housing	7,874	655	71	120	58	15
The Lodge at Pebble Beach[4]	26,929	5,030	4	22	23~~0~~	44~~0~~
Residential F-2	1,500	0	424	284	0	0
Residential F-3	800	0	161	68	0	0
Residential I-2	200	0	124	177	0	0
Residential K	0	0	23	18	14	2
Residential PQR	275	0	427	266	29	17
Corp. Yard Employee Housing[5]	38,557	25,019	1	7	0	0
Internal Road Improvements Congress Road Improvements[6]	17,095	8,270	75	95	23	0
Highway 1/68 Improvements	17,070	11,033	*25*	*28*	0	0
TOTAL	**511,695**	**500,338**	**8,288**	**7,103**	**1,382**	**387**

Source: Project Application, Forest Management Plan (Webster 2002), Forest Management Plan for 1/68 (Staub 2001); internal road improvement tree removals included in adjacent development totals; updated with information from applicant (PBC 2003b, 2003d, Zander 2003a, 2003b) regarding tree removals associated with trails, utilities, and temporary equestrian event space at the Sawmill site

Notes:

1. Includes adjacent roadways and entrances.
2. Golf course tree counts include tree removals for road improvements at Ondulado/Alva and Stevenson/Forest Lake.
3. Excludes planted Monterey pine and Gowen cypress. Includes tree removal for improvements to Congress Road and SFB Morse entry improvements.
4. In addition 2 cypress >12 inches would be removed at the Fairway One Complex.
5. No tree removal at Corporation Yard. Tree removal count is for improvements to Lopez/Sunridge.
6. Tree removal counts for other internal road improvements included in adjacent development counts as noted above.

Revised Table 2.0-6. Summary of County Permits Required by Development Area

	PLN010254								PLN010341	PLN040160
Permit Action	Golf Course	Equestrian Center	Spanish Bay Resort	Spanish Bay Driving Range	Spanish Bay Employee Housing	Lodge at Pebble Beach	Residential Subdivisions	Hwy 68/ Hwy 1/ 17-Mile Drive Improvements	Corp Yard Employee Housing	Equestrian Center
Amendment to a Combined Development Permit Application									X	
General Development Plan	X	X								
Amendment to General Development Plan			X			X			X	
Amendment to Approved Use Permit										X
Coastal Development Permit for Lot Line Adjustment						X				
Coastal Development Permit for Vesting Tentative Map	X	X		X	X		F2, F3, I2, K, PQR		X	
Coastal Development Permit for Construction	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Design Approval for Construction	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Coastal Development Permit for Development on Slopes >30%	X	X					F3, PQR*		X	
Coastal Development Permit for Development within 100 feet of ESHA	X	X		X						
Grading Permit	X	X	X	X	X	X	F2, F3, I2, K, PQR	X	X	
Tree Removal	X	X	X	X	X	X	F2, F3, I2, K, PQR	X		
Coastal Development Permit for a Conditional Certificate of Compliance	X						PQR, K			

* As proposed, these sites contain slopes in excess of 30%. As mitigated, areas in excess of 30% slope would be eliminated from the areas to be developed.

Figure 2.0-2 is revised as follows (see attached revised figure at end of this section):

Corrected boundary for Area PQR preservation area

Figure 2.0-12 is revised as follows (see attached revised figure at end of this section):

Area C conservation area and Area B preservation area identified on revised figure.

Figure 2.0-26 is revised as follows (see attached revised figure at end of this section):

Reference to "PQR conservation area" changed to "PQR preservation area"

Figure 2.0-27 is revised as follows (see attached revised figure at end of this section):

Annotated "Employee Housing Site". Preservation line adjusted to reflect boundary of employee housing area.

Figure 2.0-32 is revised as follows (see attached revised figure at end of this section):

Figure revised per revised trail map submitted by applicant in comment.

Chapter 3.1 – Land Use

Page 3.1-5, Line 16, the following is added after Line 16:

Phase 1B Highway 68/Highway 1/17 Mile Drive Interchange Improvement

The Proposed Project includes the improvement to this interchange described in Chapter 2. Phase 1B is an upgrade to an existing transportation facility within the Caltrans ROW. As such, Phase 1B is compatible and consistent with the existing designated use for this land and the consistency of this project element with land use designations is not discussed further in this document.

Page 3.1-7, lines 36 - 44 are revised as follows:

The County considers a New Equestrian Center a compatible use at this site, in recognition of voter approval of Measure A, provided the use complies with all other applicable LUP policies and Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) standards, as well as all relevant mitigation and permit conditions adopted by the County. It would provide a recreational transition between existing residential development and the preserved open space of the HHNA. A condition of approval will be required that the applicant shall submit evidence that the Coastal Commission has certified the land use plan changes contained within Measure A prior to issuance of any building or grading permit for the Proposed Project. This ~~would be~~ is considered a *less-than-significant* impact of the Proposed Project. If the relevant portions of Measure A are not certified by the CCC, then the proposed equestrian center may not be approved in its current form.

Page 3.1-9, lines 24 - 33 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure LU-A2. Amend development conditions and easements on the Sawmill site. The County and Coastal Commission would need to amend the conditions placed on the Sawmill site. The County would also need to ~~either~~ amend the recorded easement on the lower Sawmill ~~or make findings that the proposed use is consistent with these easements~~. The Coastal Commission and the DMFF would also need to either amend the recorded easement on the upper Sawmill or make findings that the proposed use is consistent with the easement for the upper Sawmill. Without these actions the relocated Equestrian Center could not be developed as proposed.

The following conditions in the 1984 Monterey County Use Permit for extraction of sand from the Sawmill site (Use Permit PC-5040) would need to be *deleted* to allow the New Equestrian Center to be implemented as proposed:

Sawmill Use Permit Condition 8. "The final graded slopes shall not exceed [a ratio of] 2:1. Slope tops shall be rounded to cause a more natural appearance. The final grade of the borrow site shall provide an internal basin to serve as a sediment basin for the borrow site, subject to the approval of the Director of Public Works and Director of Building Inspection."

- Sawmill Use Permit Condition 9. "At the completion of extraction operations, stockpiled topsoil shall be spread on site and all exposed surfaces shall be seeded with rye grass or equivalent at 100 pounds per acre."

- Sawmill Use Permit Condition 10. "The disturbed areas shall be revegetated with species currently found on-site within one year, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning. The revegetation plan shall include plantings of Monterey pines on terraces and benches to fill natural screens and to give appearance of natural forest cover and provide for plantings of Gowen cypress and Monterey pine in the pit floor. Said plan shall also conform with the OSAC standards."

In addition, the following conditions in Use Permit PC-5405 amendment would need to be *deleted* to allow the New Equestrian Center to be implemented as proposed:

- Sawmill Use Permit Amendment Condition 13 (s). "The applicant shall restore and revegetate the borrow site and adjacent deforested area as defined by the Director of Planning. Such revegetation shall conform to the Land Use Plan policies, and provide at least a one-to-one replacement..."

- Sawmill Use Permit Amendment Condition 13 (t). "The applicant shall grant a permanent scenic easement to the County of Monterey over the borrow site and adjacent deforested area as determined by the Director of Planning… The scenic easement shall: (1) permit the excavation of sand under use permit PC-5040; (2) permit the revegetation and restoration of the area it covers; (3) not permit further uses of the area it covers except those uses necessary to effectuate and maintain the restoration and revegetation plan."

Potential amendment of the 1985 CCC Coastal Development Permit for the Spanish Bay Resort (Coastal Permit 3-84-226) is under the jurisdiction of the CCC, not Monterey County. The following conditions in the Spanish Bay CDP would need to be *deleted* in order for the New Equestrian Center to be implemented as proposed:

- Condition 6c. "…together with rehabilitation of the Upper Sawmill Gulch Borrow site as part of the Huckleberry Hill Natural Habitat Area, and dedication of the rehabilitated area as open space."

- Condition 28. "…..a.1) rehabilitation of the Upper Sawmill Gulch quarry site and its incorporation into the Huckleberry Hill Natural Habitat Area…"

Page 3.1-9 Line 35 through 3.1-10 Line 2 are revised as follows

The Proposed Project was examined for consistency with the policies of the existing Del Monte Forest LCP, including the LUP and the CIP (zoning); the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan; and the adopted Monterey County General Plan. ~~The prior Spanish Bay permit conditions and associated easements for the Sawmill site were discussed above under Impact LU-A2. and the following Spanish Bay permits:~~

- ~~PC-5040 (Sawmill Borrow Site)~~
- ~~PC-5405 (Conveyor Belt)~~
- ~~PC-5874 (Amendment to new access gate condition of PC-5202)~~
- ~~PC-7253 (Restoration conditions imposed pursuant to The Links at Spanish Bay violations).~~

Page 3.1-11, Table 3.1-1 is revised as follows

Table 3.1-1. Summary of LUP Land Use Designation Consistency

Project Element	DMF LUP Land Use Designations
Proposed Golf Course	Inconsistent
New Equestrian Center	Inconsistent
Spanish Bay Resort	Inconsistent
Spanish Bay Employee Housing	Consistent
Spanish Bay Driving Range	Consistent
Lodge at Pebble Beach	Inconsistent
Residential Subdivision	Consistent
Corp. Yard Employee Housing	Consistent
Preservation	Consistent
Phase 1B Improvement/Roads	Consistent

Page 3.1-12, lines 13 through 36 are revised as follows:

The following developments are consistent with the land use designations in the LUP:

- **Spanish Bay Driving Range.** The proposed driving range is considered golf course development, which is a conditional use in areas designated MDR.

- **The Spanish Bay Employee Housing.** The proposed employee housing is considered residential use. The proposed 12 units would be within a larger area presently designated MDR (about 18 acres). The area surrounding the proposed housing would be dedicated with a conservation easement for preservation. The resultant density would be less than 1 unit per acre within the presently designated MDR area, which is less than the maximum for MDR (4 units/acre).

- **Residential Lots.** As shown in Table 3.1-2, in the Existing Setting section below, the proposed residential lots in Areas F-2, F-3, I-2, and K are all within areas presently designated for MDR and the proposed densities are far less than the maximum allowed, and would therefore meet the low-density residential (LDR)(minimum 1 acre/lot) requirements. The proposed residential lots within Area P are in an area designated LDR, but would be at a much lower density than the maximum allowed. Proposed residential lots are consistent with current LUP designations.

- **Corporation Yard Employee Housing.** The proposed employee housing is considered residential use. All residential uses are conditionally allowable in areas designated Coastal General Commercial (CGC), provided that the gross square footage of the residential use does not exceed the gross square footage of the commercial use.

- **Phase 1B Improvement/Road Improvements.** The proposed road improvements are along existing road corridors, with one exception. Where the road improvements are on existing roads, the use is considered consistent. The realignment of a portion of Stevenson Drive from its present location to a more northerly alignment as part of the golf course development is considered a necessary use for the golf course development as proposed.

Page 3.1-12, line 37 through 3.1-13 Line 2 are revised as follows:

~~The County considers the~~ The Proposed Golf Course, the New Equestrian Center, and the increase in visitor-serving units at The Lodge at Pebble Beach and The Inn at Spanish Bay ~~to be~~ are inconsistent with the land use designations in the ~~amended~~ existing LCP~~, in recognition of voter approval of Measure A.~~ A condition of approval will be required that the applicant shall submit evidence that the Coastal Commission has certified the land use plan changes contained within Measure A prior to issuance of any building or grading permit for the Proposed Project. Assuming final County approval of the application and with this condition of approval and provided the proposed uses comply with all other applicable LUP policies and CIP standards and all other relevant mitigation and permit conditions adopted by the County, this would be considered a *less-than-significant* impact. If the relevant portions of Measure A are not certified by the Coastal Commission, then ~~these aspects of~~ the project may not be approved in its current form and must be amended and resubmitted for County review by the applicant.

Page 3.1-14 Lines 6 to 10 are revised as follows:

The site is adjoined on three sides by the HHNA, portions of which include the SFB Morse Botanical Preserve. This protected natural area consists of Monterey pine forest, Bishop pine, and Gowen cypress on hilly terrain. Single-family residential development is nearby to the north and west within the Del Monte Park neighborhood of Pacific Grove and to the northwest in the Del Monte Forest.

Page 3.1-17 Lines 19 to 20 are revised as follows:

Measure A would designate the proposed residential areas LDR/1 (4 lots) and LDR/2 (3 lots) respectively, and remove the resource constraints overlay. ~~*Measure A would designate the proposed residential area for LDR/2 and remove the resource constraints overlay.*~~

Page 3.1-18 Lines 11 to 25 are revised as follows:

Area G

Area G (47.9 acres) is a vacant, forested lot of record adjoining Poppy Hills Golf Course that is zoned MDR/B8.

Measure A would designate these preservation areas as OF.

Area H

Area H (53.8 acres) consists of a vacant, forested lot of record straddling Spruance Road and east of the Poppy Hills Golf Course that is zoned MDR/B8 and RC.

Measure A would designate these preservation areas as OF.

Area I-1

Area I-1 (40.5 acres) consists of a vacant, forested lot of record located along Lopez Road, between the Spyglass Hill and Poppy Hills Golf Courses that is zoned LDR/B-8, MDR/B-8, and RC.

Measure A would designate these preservation areas as OF.

Area J

A 0.8-acre lot is to be preserved by a conservation easement. Two existing lots are to be retained for potential future residential use (these are not part of the Proposed Project).

Measure A would designate these preservation areas as OF.

Page 3.1-19 Lines 1 to 6 are revised as follows:

Area L

Area L (18.2 acres) consists of a long strip of vacant, forested land adjoining the north side of Spyglass Hill Golf Course, adjacent to Indian Village that is zoned MDR/B8.

Measure A would designate these preservation areas as OF.

~~*Measure A would change the designation of these sites to OF and remove the resource constraints overlay.*~~

Page 3.1-19, the following is added after Line 17

Phase 1B/Other Road Improvements

These locations are within existing road corridors, with the exception of the Stevenson Drive realignment, which is included within Area MNOUV/Proposed New Golf Course area described above.

Measure A would not change the designation or zoning of the road areas, except as it relates to the Stevenson Drive realignment in Area MNOUV

Table 3.1-2 following page 3.1-26 is revised as follows (see revised table):

Revised Under PQR to add "LDR/1".

Page 3.1-26, the following is added after Line 29

Measure A would rezone the 42 acres of the Sawmill site within the Coastal Zone from open space forest to open space recreation.

Figures 3.1-1and 3.1-2 following Page 3.1-26 are revised as follows (see revised figure).

Corrected boundary for Preservation Area PQR.

Revised Table 3.1-2. Del Monte Forest Zoning Designations Relevant to Project Sites

Area	Proposed Project Use	Existing LCP Zoning	Post-Measure A Zoning
MNOUV	Proposed Golf Course VSC (24 rooms) Preservation	LDR/B-8 LDR/1.5 MDR/B-8 OR RC	OR VSC
Sawmill	New Equestrian Center	MDR RC	MDR OR
Spanish Bay	VS (91 units)	VSC	VSC
C	Driving Range Preservation	MDR/B-8	OR
B	Employee Housing (12) Preservation	MDR/B-8 RC	MDR RC
PB Lodge	VS (58 units)	CGC VSC	No Change
D	Preservation	MDR/4	MDR/4
F	Residential (14 lots) Preservation	MDR/B-8 RC	LDR/1.5 LDR/4 RC
G	Preservation	MDR/B-8 RC	RC
H	Preservation	MDR/B-8 RC	RC
I	Residential (11 lots) Preservation	LDR/B-8 MDR/B-8 RC	LDR/1.5 RC
J	Preservation	MDR/B-8 MDR/2 MDR/4	LDR/2 LDR/4 RC
K	Residential (1 lot) Preservation	MDR/B-8	LDR/6 OR
L	Preservation	MDR/B-8	RC
PQR	Residential (7 lots) Preservation	LDR/1/B-8 RC	LDR/2 RC
Corp Yard	Employee Housing (48) Preservation	CGC/B-8 IC/B-8	CGC IC

Key:
LDR = Low-Density residential (LDR/X = X acres/unit)
MDR = Medium-Density residential (MDR/X = X units/acre)
VSC = Visitor-Serving Commercial
CGC = Coastal General Commercial
IC = Institutional Commercial
OR = Open Space Recreation
RC = Resource Conservation
B-8 = Resource Constrained

Chapter 3.2 – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Page 3.2-3 Lines 1 to 6 are revised as follows:

The project will involve excavation of approximately 512,000 cubic yards, most of which will be at the Proposed Golf Course location. Other areas of major excavation (>20,000 cubic yards) include the underground parking lot sites at the Inn at Spanish Bay and The Lodge at Pebble Beach, as well as at the New Equestrian Center and Corporation Yard Employee Housing sites. Table 2.0-4" ~~Table 2.0-6~~ in Chapter 2, "Project Description" identifies the cut and fill amounts by location.

Page 3.2-7 Lines 3 to 10 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure GSS-B1-1. Revise tentative maps to exclude all portions of residential lots in Area F-3 and Area PQR with slopes greater than 30% from residential subdivision lots (or exclude these areas from building envelopes) and dedicate conservation easements for these areas. The tentative maps shall be revised to exclude these steep slope areas from residential subdivision or from inclusion in the building envelopes. When excluded from the residential subdivisions t~~T~~hese areas of steep slopes shall be incorporated into the adjacent proposed preservation and conservation areas. Residential development plans will be reviewed for compliance by Monterey County planning staff.

Page 3.2-7 Lines 11 to 34 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure GSS-B1-2. Implement recommended design criteria of the Geotechnical Engineer of Record at the Proposed Golf Course and Corporation Yard Employee Housing sites where structures are proposed in areas of steep slopes or slope instability. The applicant shall implement the recommended design criteria of the geotechnical engineer of record during the final design and construction of the proposed developments. All design criteria shall be in conformance with the standards of the California Building Code and all other applicable, county and local building code standards.

The following specific recommendations in the existing geotechnical reports for the golf cottages and the Corporation Yard employee housing shall also apply:

- Golf Cottages - grading to ensure adequate removal of unsuitable fill materials, proper placement of engineered fills beneath proposed building sites, uniform bearing support for foundations and adequate surface and subsurface drainage during and after construction (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, 2001d; Nielsen and Associates 2002d).

- Corporation Yard - grading to ensure ~~endure~~ adequate removal of unsuitable fill materials and proper placement of engineered fills beneath proposed building sites, uniform bearing support for the proposed

structures and adequate surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, 2001g).

These criteria may be refined and or new ones added during final stages of project design and construction.

Page 3.2-8 Lines 9 to 15 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure GSS-B1-3. Implement recommended design criteria of the Geotechnical Engineer of Record at the Proposed Golf Course and New Equestrian Center where steep slopes would be manufactured. The applicant shall implement the recommended design criteria of the geotechnical engineer of record during the final design and construction of the proposed developments. All design criteria shall be in conformance with the standards of the California Building Code and all other applicable, county and local building code standards.

The following specific recommendations in the existing geotechnical reports for the Proposed Golf Course and the New Equestrian Center shall also apply:

- Golf Cottages - permanent fill slope gradients be no steeper than 2:1 (h:v) and permanent cut slopes should be no steeper than 1 to 1.5:1 (h:v) in terrace deposits and bedrock materials and 2.5:1 (h:v) in sand dune deposits (provided seepage or groundwater is not observed in the cuts) (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, 1996a).

- Corporation Yard - permanent fill slope gradients be no steeper than 2:1 (h:v); permanent cut slopes that expose dune sand or terrace deposit should have a maximum slope gradient of 2:1 (h:v); ~~pan~~ permanent cut slopes that expose granite or sandstone bedrock should have a maximum slope gradient of 1.5:1 (h:v) provided seepage or groundwater is not observed in the cuts. (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, 1996b).

If seepage or groundwater is observed within cut or fill slopes, additional measures from the geotechnical engineer of record will be necessary. Slopes with the recommended gradients may require periodic maintenance to remove minor soils sloughing and erosion. These criteria may be refined and or new ones added during final stages of project design and construction.

Page 3.2-13 Lines 25 to 27are revised as follows:

San Andreas Fault: located ~28 miles from the Del Monte Forest

Sargent Fault: ~~Argent Fault:~~ located ~31 miles from the Del Monte Forest

Page 3.2-16 Lines 16 to 17 are revised as follows:

Topography in the proposed development sites is predominantly level to ~~strongly~~ sloping (0 to 16% slopes).

Table 3.2-5 after p. 3.2-16, The Lodge at Pebble Beach, 3rd paragraph, 1st line is revised as follows (see revised table):

"loose saturates subsurface zone" changed to read "loose saturated subsurface zone"

Table 3.2-5, after p. 3.2-16. Corporation Yard Employee Housing, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line is revised as follows (see revised table):

"endure" changed to "ensure"

Page 3.2-17 Lines 20 to 24 are revised as follows:

The annular space sensors for all three USTs failed function tests in October 1997; the monitoring system was later upgraded. ~~upgraded,~~ Two sumps are located in the corporation yard, one in the fueling area. Two hydraulic hoists are operated at the yard, with underground piping leading to ~~an~~ aboveground hydraulic oil tanks.

Page 3.2 – 17 Lines 29 to 41 are revised as follows:

Landfill. DMCE identified that a portion of the Del Monte quarry was used as an unsupervised dumping ground for many years. During a prior subsurface geotechnical investigation, debris encountered in the fill material included wood chunks, decayed wood fragments, metal, plastic, ~~-~~concrete, asphalt and masonry; all inert debris. Based on the prior subsurface investigation, a fill area was identified on the site, measuring up to 60 feet thick. The fill material has a strong "fuel-type odor", but this was attributed to decaying organic matter. DMCE identified that methane off-gassing may also be occurring in this area. DMCE did not find evidence that hazardous materials were dumped in this area. DMCE identifies that there is an absence of beneficial uses of ground water in this bedrock bowl. DMCE did not identify the landfill as a recognized environmental condition and did not recommend further analytical testing (DMCE 1999).

Page 3.2-17 Lines 42 to 45 are revised as follows:

The 2002 site reconnaissance and records review did not identify any evidence of stains, fuels or potentially hazardous materials at the area proposed for the employee housing and did not identify any spills, contaminant, or leak files for the Corporation Yard site in ~~on~~ files at the MCHD (DMCE 2002).

Revised Table 3.2-5. Summary of Hazards and Concerns mentioned in Geotechnical and Geologic Reports

Project Development Area	Hazards and Concerns Mentioned
Proposed Golf Course	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of the Proposed Golf Course and associated structures. Site-specific concerns include: Golf Course: providing secure and uniform support for the proposed structure foundations, redensifing or removing existing fill from building and parking lot areas, providing adequate surface and subsurface site drainage and the potential for strong seismic shaking Golf Cottages: strong seismic shaking, extensive grading to ensure adequate removal of unsuitable fill materials, proper placement of engineered fills beneath proposed building sites, uniform bearing support for foundations and adequate surface and subsurface drainage during and after construction. Golf Clubhouse: strong seismic shaking, high groundwater, adequate surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction, presence of high groundwater, uniform bearing support for foundations, and stability of temporary cut slopes Golf Course Restrooms: Proposed buildings may be constructed on conventional spread footings embedded into redensified, on-site native soil. Other concerns include the shallow perched groundwater table that occurs during the winter rain season; a thin layer of clay found about a foot below ground surface; and the wet, loose condition of the near-surface, foundation-zone soils.
New Equestrian Center	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of the New Equestrian Center. Concerns: uniform support for the proposed structure foundations, adequate surface site drainage, erosion potential, the potential for strong seismic shaking, mitigation of loose fill below proposed structures.; presence of gullying and shallow groundwater.
Spanish Bay Resort	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of the Spanish Bay Resort Concerns: strong seismic shaking, provision for adequate surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction, firm and uniform bearing support for foundations, weak zone of granitic rock at proposed underground structure and stability of temporary cut slopes; and high groundwater conditions
Spanish Bay Driving Range	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of the Spanish Bay Driving Range. Concerns: strong seismic shaking, controlled grading to ensure proper placement of engineered fills beneath the proposed building site and pavement sections, surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction, and secure uniform bearing support for foundations.
Spanish Bay Employee Housing	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of the Spanish Bay Employee Housing Concerns: strong seismic shaking, extensive grading to ensure adequate removal of unsuitable fill materials and proper placement of engineered fills beneath proposed building sites, surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction, high groundwater; and secure, uniform bearing support for foundations.

Project Development Area	Hazards and Concerns Mentioned
The Lodge at Pebble Beach	No adverse geotechnical or geologic hazards that would preclude the development of any project components at The Lodge at Pebble Beach. Concerns for all sites include strong seismic shaking, firm and uniform bearing support for foundations, and provision for adequate surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction. Site specific concerns include: Underground Parking Structure: loose saturated~~s~~ subsurface zone and stability of temporary cut slopes, potential for significant groundwater; Fairway One structure: potential for local weak subsurface zones and stability of temporary cut slopes, potential for significant groundwater.
Residential Subdivisions	Note: No geotechnical or geologic reports submitted by applicant for subdivisions. Information based on prior EIR (EIP 1995) and site slope maps (PBC 2002). No identified geo-seismic hazards or constraints that would preclude the development overall of the proposed residential subdivisions, with potential exception of landslide potential on portions of several lots (noted below). Concerns for all sites: strong seismic shaking, stability of temporary cut slopes; expansive/weak soils, erosion potential. Specific concern for Areas F-3, K, and PQR: potential for landsliding on areas with steep slopes.
Corporation Yard Employee Housing	No adverse hazards that would preclude the development of the Corporation Yard Employee Housing. Concerns: strong seismic shaking, slope instability within the old landfill slopes, settlement of the existing landfill materials, extensive grading to ensure adequate removal of unsuitable fill materials and proper placement of engineered fills beneath proposed building sites, uniform bearing support for the proposed structures and adequate surface and subsurface site drainage during and after construction.
Highway 1/68	No adverse geotechnical hazards identified that would preclude construction of the proposed roadway improvements

Source: Foxx, Nielsen and Associates 1990a, b; Haro, Kasunich and Associates 2001a–g, 2002a, b; M. Jacobs & Associates 1990, 1991a, b; Mark Thomas & Co. Inc. 2001; Nielsen and Associates 2002a–i; Terratech Inc. 1991; Parikh Consultants, 2001(for Highway 1/68); EIP 1995 (for residential areas).

Chapter 3.3 – Biological Resources

Page 3.3-1 Lines 7 to 11 are revised as follows:

Details of existing studies, reviews, and species characteristics are provided in Appendix E. Due to the number of project sites and the complexity of the biological resources found in the project area, a brief summary setting for Biological Resources is presented at the end of this section and a detailed biological resource setting is ~~in~~ presented separately in Appendix E.

Page 3.3-3 Lines 26 is revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would add 2.4 ~~3.~~6 miles of new trails.

Page 3.3-4 Lines 24-25 are revised as follows:

- Wetlands: Del Monte Forest Preservation and Development Plan (WRA 2001) with additional post-project best management practices for wetlands and hydrology found in the Watershed Hydrology Report, Pebble Beach, Monterey County, California – Phase II Results Report: July 2003 (Balance Hydrologics 2003)

Page 3.3-7 Lines 27 to 30 are revised as follows:

Point Lobos buckwheat (*Eriogonum parviflorium ssp. lucidum), a* synonym for seacliff or dune buckwheat (*Eriogonum parviflorium*), is an ESHA plant within shoreline areas within Smith's blue butterfly habitat and is discussed below under potential impacts to the butterfly.

Page 3.3-8 Lines 9 to 13 are revised as follows:

A coastal dune restoration plan that would be implemented as part of the Proposed Golf Course contains several elements for avoiding future impacts; mitigating current impacts (e.g., the current use of the "Green Trail" and informal trails through the dune area); and restoring, enhancing, and preserving 33.17 ~~33.49~~ acres of dune habitat (see Project Characteristics above).

Page 3.3-9, Line 24 through Page 3.3-11 Line 6 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-A1-1. Redesign the proposed golf trail as an elevated pedestrian trail which avoids locations of special status species, designate the ~~line of play areas at Hole 16 within~~ the Dune ESHA as out of play, and incorporate positive physical barriers between the golf course and delineated Dune ESHA and along designated trails. Implement drainage, landscape, pesticide, fertilizer, and irrigation controls around the Dune ESHA edge to reduce indirect effects of golf course maintenance. This measure includes the following elements.

- Redesign the proposed golf trail as an elevated pedestrian/golf cart trail that avoids the locations of special-status species in the remnant dune area. Piers supporting this walkway shall be separated by a minimum of six feet in order to limit impact. The trail shall have a railing and have a maximum width of 4 feet, unless more is required by ADA standards. This elevated trail shall follow the existing trail to the greatest extent possible. This trail can allow expanded public access and appreciation of the Coastal dune for golfers, but shall exclude all motorized vehicles, other than electric golf carts and emergency vehicles.

- ~~Designate the line of play within~~ The Dune ESHA ~~associated with Hole 16~~ shall be designated as out of play to prevent ball retrieval within the ESHA and place positive physical barriers to prevent golfer access. Ball retrieval in this area will only be by maintenance personnel who have gone through an environmental education program that identifies the sensitive resources in the dune area and how to avoid impacts. All ball retrieval will be by hand only without the use of tools, mechanical or otherwise.

- Install permanent physical barriers between the edge of the golf course and all portions of the Dune ESHA to prevent all direct access. The barriers shall be a minimum of 42 inches high and shall be constructed in a manner that discourages pedestrians from crossing the barrier.

- Install permanent physical barriers along the edge of the "Green Trail" and other portions of the Dune ESHA as necessary to prevent pedestrians from use or creation of informal trails in the remnant dune area. The barriers shall be a minimum of 42 inches highand shall be constructed in a manner that discourages pedestrians from the crossing the barrier.

- Route all surface and subsurface drainage related to Holes 15, 16, and 17 turf and rough to the Spyglass drainage system and away from the Signal Hill Dune ESHA to avoid inadvertent irrigation of the native dune vegetation. Means to implement could include (but are not limited to), creation of favorable surface topography, interceptor trenches, and subsurface drains.

- Only native landscaping is to be used in the area immediately surrounding the tee boxes at Hole No. 15 and Hole No. 16 except for the golf access path. The golf course landscaped area between the Hole No. 17 green and the Dune ESHA area shall be a maximum width of 25 feet. Non-native species shall be removed from the area between the No. 15 and No. 16 tee boxes and the Dune ESHA boundary and between the No. 17 landscaped area around the green. These areas along the ESHA edge shall be restored using native dune plant species. Final site plans shall include a specific landscaping plan showing the location of all turf and rough areas and areas of specified native plant landscaping.

- Application of pesticides and fertilizers to the Hole No. 15 tees, the No. 16 tees and the portions of Hole No. 17 within 50 feet of the Dune ESHA

shall be by hand, unless the Director of Planning & Building Inspection approves otherwise after demonstration by multi-year monitoring that pesticide and fertilizer application is having no substantial adverse effect on native vegetation within the Signal Hill Dune ESHA.

- Irrigation of the Hole No. 15 tees, the No. 16 tees and the portions of Hole No. 17 within 50 feet of the Dune ESHA shall avoid inadvertent irrigation of native vegetation within the Signal Hill Dune ESHA by using directional irrigation, small-scale irrigation, other means and/or operational controls such as irrigating only when winds are low and directed inland away from the dune ESHA area.

- Pesticides shall only be applied in the area within 100 feet of the ESHA boundary when wind speeds are less than 10 mph. Drift-reduction agents shall be used which thicken pesticides and reduce the potential to form droplets smaller than 150 microns. Examples of drift reduction agents include Chem-Trol, Intac, Lo-Drift, Nalco-Trol, Nalco-Trol II, StaPut, Wind-Fall, Arborchem 38-F (Bellinger et al. 1996). Records of pesticide applications shall be kept, including information about quantity applied, method used, and wind speed at the time of application.

- Slow-release nitrogen fertilizers shall be employed in areas upslope of the ESHA to prevent excess nitrogen pollution of the ESHA during drier months and whenever feasible (Environmental Protection Agency 2001). Fertilizers should not be applied within 200 feet of the ESHA in cool rainy weather as feasible, as reduced plant growth rates and microbial activity and increased runoff potential (University of Minnesota Extension Service 1997) will increase the probability of contamination of the ESHA. When fertilizers are applied within 200 feet in cool rainy weather, small increments of quick-release nitrogen (sprayed as a liquid directly to plant tissue), provided caution is used to avoid any resultant runoff into the ESHA area. Phosphorus fertilizer which is applied to areas upslope of the ESHA is to be watered in immediately following application to prevent them from being washed into the ESHA in surface runoff. When phosphorus fertilizers have not yet been incorporated into the soil, they may be carried away from the application site with sediment runoff (University of Minnesota Extension Service 1997)

Mitigation Measure BIO-A1-2. Include dune species habitat management and performance criteria into the Master RMP and the Site-Specific RMPs as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1. Part of the Annual Work Plan monitoring will be to document progress toward meeting the following success criteria:

- Irrigation systems shall be designed to ensure that, under windless conditions, restored dune habitat is not subject to substantial overspray.

- Rare plant dune restoration areas shall be located away from the perimeter of the golf course unless such mitigation areas are not located where they are likely to be directly affected by recovery of errant golf

balls, the logical traffic pattern of golfers, or the movement of spectators. Habitats created or restored within the golf course perimeter shall be regarded and managed as landscape features rather than habitat mitigation.

- Integrate the dune restoration and creation methods described in the EMIP (County of Monterey and EcoSynthesis 1998) into the proposed coastal dune restoration plan (Zander 2001a).

- As part of the seed collection effort proposed for special-status plants, the applicant shall limit collection to no more than 10% of the fruits from any one plant and no more than 5% of the total seed production from an occurrence in any one year.

- The following monitoring criteria will be used to determine restoration success:

  a. absolute cover at least 70% that of a suitable reference site, or of an offsite natural dune with vegetation composed of similar species to those used in dune habitat revegetation;

  b. no more than 10 ~~20~~% relative cover of nonnative species and no more than 5 ~~10~~% relative cover of any invasive species (e.g., ice plant, pampas grass, gorse, acacia);

  c. at least 70% of native species characteristic of dunes or dune scrub as are found in the reference site(s);

  d. dominance of the dune vegetation by at least three of the five native species of highest relative cover on the reference sites; and

  e. establishment of additional subpopulations of each species, consistent with site-specific assessments.

The applicant shall dedicate the Signal Hill Conservation Area in a conservation easement (as proposed) and conduct the restoration described in the Dunes Report (Zander, 2001) and in this measure. Restoration activities shall be conducted until the performance criteria are met in three out of five successive years. After the performance criteria are met, the applicant shall be responsible for periodic monitoring on a frequency no greater than every five years. If periodic monitoring identifies that the dune habitat within the conservation area no longer meets the restoration performance criteria, then remedial activity (including the restoration measures in the dune plan, this mitigation, or other measures as necessary) shall be conducted until the performance criteria are met again in three out of five successive years.

Monitoring of the Dune ESHA shall include monitoring of:

- native vegetation;

- non-native species;
- golf course irrigation;
- pesticide and fertilizer use; and
- the indirect effects on the Dune ESHA (in particular on the edge of the Dune ESHA directly adjacent to the Proposed Golf Course).

Monitoring shall be done by an independent party under contract to Monterey County as part of the implementation of the Site-Specific Monitoring Plan for this location. If monitoring identifies that substantial adverse change in dune vegetation adjacent to the golf course is occurring, remedial action shall include change in golf course maintenance practices (irrigation, pesticide, fertilizer, mowing, seeding, etc.) as necessary to address the identified effects. If changes in golf course maintenance practices are determined insufficient (via independent monitoring) to remedy the identified effects, then the applicant shall be responsible to redesign and modify Holes No. 15, 16, and 17 to provide for an adequate buffer between all landscaped portions of the golf course (including rough) and the Dune ESHA area to address the identified adverse effects. This buffer shall be a minimum of 50-feet in width, unless the Directors of Planning & Building Inspection determines that a buffer of less width will address the identified adverse effects after consultation with the resource management team that will be advising Monterey County on Site-Specific Resource Management Plan implementation.

This responsibility for monitoring, maintenance, and remedial activity is in perpetuity.

Page 3.3-13, Line 31 through 36 are revised as follows:

Mitigation BIO-A4. Revise the tentative map for Area F-3 Lot 1 to exclude the Bishop pine/Gowen cypress area and provide for a buffer that contains the area within 3 times the radius of the canopy of any Bishop pine/Gowen cypress near the edge of the ESHA area and expand the proposed dedication area to include all of the ESHA area and the buffer area.

The applicant has proposed dedication of a preservation area containing Bishop pine/Gowen cypress forest on the north side of F-3 and Monterey pine forest on the east side of F-3. The area of Bishop pine/Gowen Cypress forest and a buffer area within present boundary of Lot 1 should be added to this dedication and the Lot 1 boundary revised in the tentative map. The buffer area should be delineated in the field to contain all areas within a distance three times the canopy radius of any Gowen cypress or Bishop pine near the edge of the ESHA area. This buffer area is designed to avoid any impacts to the root system of Gowen cypress within the ESHA area.

[Note: The Proposed Project also includes restoration of approximately 1.6 acres of Gowen cypress/Bishop pine forest. Impacts to individual Gowen cypress and proposed restoration are discussed below under Impact BIO-D2).

Page 3.3-14, the following text is added before Line 19:

The trails in the HHNA are presently used by hikers and equestrians. Illegal use of the trails by mountain bikers and motocross riders also occurs, although this is prohibited, resulting in erosion in certain areas as evidenced by tire tracks. There are areas of erosion apparent along certain trails, particularly along steep, narrow trails that are adjacent to Sawmill Gulch tributaries. Erosion and drainage improvements have been implemented along certain trail segments. The applicant, volunteers from the Pebble Beach Riding & Trails Association, and others in the community conduct periodic maintenance of the trails in HHNA.

Page 3.3-15 Lines 38 to 41 are revised as follows:

~~This memo lists the results of my walk along the mapped single-track trails in Huckleberry Hill Natural Area (including SFB Morse Preserve). Attached is a map showing the locations of the single-track trails in Huckleberry Hill Natural Area and also some photos of single-track trails.~~

Page 3.3-15, Line 41 to Page 3.3-17, Line 32 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-A5. Protect special status plants, Monterey pygmy forest, and other sensitive biological resources in the HHNA from substantial disruption due to increased equestrian and pedestrian use. The following measures shall be incorporated into the site-specific RMPs and Annual Work Plan and Monitoring Plan required by Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1

- Implement an annual program of erosion control and trail maintenance along trails in the HHNA.

- Permanently close and revegetate all informal "social" trails in the HHNA. Prohibit to the maximum extent feasible the potential use of designated HHNA trails by bicyclists and motorcyclists by placing signage at every trailhead stating the prohibition of use by bicycles and motorcycles and by placing physical barriers that would be difficult for bicyclists and motorcyclists to cross easily, but would allow pedestrian and equestrian crossing. Examples of such a barrier would be wooden barriers 18 to 20" high at trailheads and at entrances to single-track trails.

- ~~Use only certified noxious weed-free feed for feed of all horses stabled at the New Equestrian Center that meet the guidelines established under California Food and Agriculture Code Section 5101 and 5205. Encourage all users of the New Equestrian Center to feed their horses noxious weed-free feed for two days prior to bringing horses to the Del Monte Forest for boarding or equestrian events. Provide information to horse owners attending special events about suppliers of weed-free feed.~~

- Incorporate environmental education about the sensitive resources of the HHNA to all trail users and attendees at special events including measures that individuals can implement to lower their impact such as not hitching horses to trees, crossing drainages at marked crossings, and staying on designated trails~~, and use of noxious weed-free feed.~~

- Monitor trails and trail crossings of drainages during the wet season, temporarily close single-track trails and other HHNA trails to equestrian traffic ~~trails~~ when monitoring identifies that a substantial erosion potential exists, and conduct periodic maintenance as necessary to prevent soil erosion and sedimentation from subsequent storm events. The applicant shall develop a protocol for implementing monitoring, temporary trail closures, and periodic maintenance that will be incorporated into the HHNA RMP. Trail closures should be coordinated between the applicant, the Pebble Beach Equestrian Center, and the Pebble Beach Riding and Trail Association.

- Control potential spread of non-native invasive plant species from the New Equestrian Center into the surrounding HHNA by use of hay bins/troughs, watering, and routine cleanup of stray hay.

- Conduct at least annual (and more frequent if necessary) ~~noxious~~ weed control surveys of the HHNA (both along trails and off trails) and use manual, mechanical, and appropriate chemical or other means of control where infestation of ~~noxious~~ weeds is identified. Annual weed monitoring shall include targeted monitoring in areas of heavy horse use within the Monterey pygmy forest to examine if trail use and horse manure may be resulting in substantial spread of non-native invasive plant species or substantial change in native vegetation composition along trails. Weed control, more frequent manure cleanup, or other measures shall be implemented, as necessary to avoid substantial change in native Monterey pygmy forest vegetation.

Once the following conditions are met, require use of certified weed-free feed for all horses stabled at the New Equestrian Center:

- A certification process is adopted by the California Department of Food and Agriculture for weed-free feed; and

- A certified weed-free feed supplier is located within 50 miles of the Del Monte Forest.

Following implementation of weed-free feed requirements at the New Equestrian Center, encourage all guests to feed their horses certified weed-free feed for two days prior to bringing horses to the Del Monte Forest for boarding or equestrian events, and provide information to all horse owners attending special events about suppliers of weed-free feed.

An assessment of the single-track trails within HHNA was conducted to identify the sensitivity of different trails to increased erosion, widening, and loss of vegetation due to increased equestrian use. In addition, the connectivity of trails within HHNA and within the Del Monte Forest was assessed in order to consider the potential recreational effects of possible closure of certain trails to equestrian use. Based on this assessment, the following mitigation is proposed to reduce the impact of increased equestrian use on HHNA/SFB Morse Preserve, while balancing recreational needs:

- Restrict equestrian use of the two single-track trail segments that parallel drainages in the HHNA - the Rudd Crawford Trail (b/w Congress and Fire Rd. #6) and the Green Trail/Red Trail between a point 100 yards east of Congress Rd. and Fire Rd #6. Place horse barriers/gates and fencing at entry to these single-track trails segments. Post signage directing equestrian users to designated trails including trailhead oversize maps. Redesignate loop trail markings as necessary.

Implement of this mitigation would assure that these two trails would not be adversely effected by increased horse trail use; allow for connectivity within HHNA and the Del Monte Forest; and route horse traffic to existing trails that are, in general more suitable and can be better managed for the increased equestrian use. Connectivity would be provided as follows:

- Access northwesterly toward the Coast – direct horse traffic to utilize Fire Road #3 and/or Fire Road #5 to reach Fire Road #2, then use Fire Road #2 to Congress Road, and then ~~either~~ use ~~the Road or~~ the Blue Trail to reach the Green Trail heading northwest to MPCC and the coast. Access directly from the New Equestrian Center to the Green/Red Trail westward can be provided by designating an equestrian trail between the Lower Sawmill and the last 100 yards of the Green Trail (east of Congress Road) using existing roads and informal trails that are presently cleared of vegetation, wherever feasible. If native vegetation must be cleared to facilitate this trail connection, a biological survey of the cleared area shall be conducted to identify a preferred route that avoids removal of special-status plant species to the maximum extent feasible. Tree trimming is allowed, but not removal to facilitate this trail connection. The applicant shall transplant, replant, or otherwise restore any removed special-status plants on a 1:1 basis within the nearest appropriate disturbed area within HHNA.

- Congress Road Trail Crossings – the Red and Green Trail crossings of Congress Road shall be improved to include crosswalk striping across the roadway, and warning signage for autos traveling both directions on Congress Road.

- Access southwesterly toward F-3, G, H, and PQR – direct horse traffic to utilize Fire Roads to reach the Green Trail heading westward toward F-3.

- Access westerly toward F-1, and Forest Lake – direct horse traffic to Fire Roads to reach Fire Road #1, travel north to the Red Trail, use the Red Trail westward towards Forest Lake.

- Circulation within HHNA – a round-trip circuit through parts of SFB Morse can be completed by utilizing Fire Roads #1 and #2 and utilizing the Blue Trail along Congress Road. Although it would be preferable (for resource protection) to close the Blue Trail to equestrian use, closure of this trail would force horses onto Congress Road, which would be a safety concern, and is thus not proposed.

The applicant shall incorporate these measures into an operations plan for the New Equestrian Center and into the site-specific RMPs for the HHNA and the Sawmill site.

Page 3.3-18, immediately following Line 21, the following text is added:

"Edge" effects refer to the effects on a forest and its resources resulting from their proximity to the interface with non-forest land use. The forest "interior" is the portion of the forest sufficiently far from the edge not to be affected by adjacent land use. Edge effects will increase where there is an increase in the amount of forest edge due to forest removal and the presence of adjacent development. Some examples of edge effects that can occur due to forest removal include: increase in sunlight and temperature, increase in wind exposure, change in humidity levels, drift of pesticides and herbicides, increase in noise levels, increase in dust (particularly adjacent to roads or construction sites), increase in potential for invasive species, trampling and disruption due to human and pet access. The distance over which these different effects extend from the forest edge toward the interior varies. The consequences of these edge effects for native vegetation can include: reduction in vegetation health, replacement by invasive species or vegetation more suited to altered conditions, and changes in vegetation density and associations. The consequences of edge effects for native wildlife can include: loss of cover, loss of forage species, competition or harassment by domestic wildlife, relative increase in species accustomed to human presence (such as raccoons and crows), increased predation by species colonizing the edge area, and loss of refuge.

Page 3.3-19, lines 27 through 29 are revised as follows:

Golf Course activities, particularly major events, would result in increased foot traffic on trails through the retained forest and could damage ~~to~~ understory vegetation.

Table 3.3-2, following page 3.3-19 has been updated to provide the correct forest acreage's (see enclosed revised table).

Page 3.3-22, Lines 8 through 10 are revised as follows:

Revised Table 3.3-2. Summary of Project Impacts on Undeveloped Monterey Pine Forest in a Regional Context (acres)

Location	Historic Size (1)	Present Size (2)	Preserved at Present (3)	Change in Size (2)	Preserved by Project (2)
DMF/PDP Project Areas	N/A	680	0	-127	458
DMF outside of Project Areas	N/A	977 ~~1,031~~	474	0	0
Subtotal Del Monte Forest	N/A	1,657	474	-127	458
Percents		~~1,710~~	29%~~28%~~	-8% ~~-7%~~	+28% ~~+27%~~
Monterey Region Outside of DMF	N/A	7,632 ~~7,694~~	2491	0	0
Subtotal Monterey Region	18,324	9,289	2965	-127	458
Percents		~~9,405~~	32%	-1%	+5%
Ano Nuevo	1,500	1,500	30		
Cambria	3,500	2,300	100		
Subtotal California	23,324	13,089 ~~13,205~~	3,095	-127	458
Percents			*24%* ~~*23%*~~	*-1%*	*+4%* ~~*+3%*~~
Cedros Island (Mexico)	370	370			
Guadalupe Island (Mexico)	Unknown	<1			
Subtotal Mexico	370	370			
TOTAL	23,694	13,459 ~~13,575~~	3,095	-127	458
Percents			23%	*-1%*	*+3%*

(1) J&S 1996 b; J&S 2004

(2) Project information from sources cited in Table 3.3-1. Source for other than project information = J&S 1996b.

(3) J&S 1996b, Huffman & Associates 1994, Zander & Associates 2002a, PBC 2003a, County of Monterey 2002a. See TableE-3 in Appendix E.

Overall loss and conversion of 127 ~~130~~ acres represents approximately 8% ~~7%~~ of the remaining undeveloped Monterey pine forest in the Del Monte Forest and about 1% of the undeveloped forest in the Monterey region (see Table 3.3-2).

Page 3.3-23 Lines 12 to 15 are revised as follows:

Applicant - Proposed Preservation Adjacent to HHNA. The proposed preservation areas include areas adjacent to HHNA totaling 134 ~~133~~ acres [Area D (17 acres), Area F-3 (9 acres), Area G (48 acres), Area H (54 acres), and the Corporate Yard Preservation Area (6 acres)].

Page 3.3-24 Line 28 through Page 3.3-25 Line 25 are modified as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1. Develop, implement, and monitor Monterey County-approved Master RMP and site-specific RMPs (SSRMPs) for all proposed and additionally required retention, restoration, and preservation areas. Develop and implement Annual Work Plan and Monitoring Reports and conduct monitoring for a minimum period of 20 years. *[Note: this mitigation applies to a number of different biological resources, and thus language refers to Monterey pine forest as well as other resources].* Monterey County will ~~The applicant will be required to~~ retain a third-party consultant ~~(approved by Monterey County)~~ to finalize ~~prepare~~ a Master RMP and prepare final site-specific RMPs that will apply the mitigation in this DEIR and within the applicant's resource management plans for each affected resource (e.g., Monterey pine forest, individual special-status plant and wildlife species, wetlands, etc.) to all proposed and required retention, restoration, conservation, and preservation areas.

The Master and site-specific RMPs, shall include the following:

- proposed resource management methods, timing, and scheduling;
- ~~■~~ monitoring methods, procedures, and personnel; ~~and~~
- reporting procedures and timing;
- a guarantee of full funding and implementation by the applicant of the County-approved SSRMP; and
- a guarantee of full funding by the applicant for independent monitoring of SSRMP implementation by a County-retained qualified consultant

Specific measures for Monterey pine forest restoration and management and each special-status plant that is targeted for reestablishment, transplantation, propagation, outplanting, enhancement or *in situ* management will be included in the Master RMP and the site-specific RMPs. The USFWS policy guidelines regarding controlled propagation of listed species will be followed for the reintroduction or establishment of new populations of federally listed species (65

FR 56916) where proposed within the applicant's resource management plans or mitigation in this document.

Each site-specific RMP will contain the following elements regarding special-status plants:

- detailed transplantation, propagation, and outplanting methods (where this is approved within the Master RMP and the SSRMP)
- description and mapped locations for "donor sites";
- site selection methods (donor sites, reestablishment sites, and transplantation sites);
- site protection measures (e.g., type and location of fencing);
- adaptive management plan ~~(including weed control);~~
- success criteria;
- an education program for construction and maintenance workers; and
- monitoring and reporting methods (monitoring and reporting shall be conducted annually for the first 5 years and every two years after 5 years until the success criteria have been met).

The SSRMPs shall also include a weed management program for each preservation, conservation, and resource management area that includes the following:

- "Weeds" shall be defined as including any invasive non-native plant species identified in the Del Monte Forest as problematic including iceplant (*Carpobrotus edulis* and *C. chilense*), pampas grass (*Cortaderia jubata*), acacia (*Aciacia longifolia* and *A. verticillat*a), gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), kikuyu grass (*Pennisetum clandestinum*), and French broom (*Genista monspessulana*), and any species listed on the latest version of the California Invasive Plant Council's list of "Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California."
- Periodic weed control surveys shall be conducted by a qualified botanist based on the level and type of weed infestation present.
- Periodic weed control shall be conducted based on the level and type of weed infestation present. More frequent surveys and removal shall be required if necessary to control infestation from further spread and to meet the performance criteria as described below. Weed control shall be conducted under the oversight of a qualified biologist.
- Weed control methods including manual, mechanical, and appropriate chemical or other means of control as determined by the specific weed

species, infestation level, and sensitivity of surrounding biological resources.

- Weed control protocols for cleaning of clothing, shoes, and equipment to prevent inadvertent spread of weed seed.
- Education of workers conducting weed control to avoid inadvertent adverse effects to special-status species or sensitive vegetation areas.
- Specific goals for control of weeds (for example: complete eradication, maintenance of levels below X% relative cover, removal of all reproductive individuals) depending on the weed species and the surrounding biological resources.
- Long-term commitment to management of weeds below levels that adversely affect sensitive biological resources.

Page 3.3-25, Lines 26-33 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-2. Minimize the loss of Monterey pine forest due to residential development by reducing the building envelope for all proposed lots to a maximum of 0.5 acre. The existing building envelopes for residential lots in Areas F-2, F-3, I-2, and PQR vary in size, but average between 0.9 and 1.3 acres; the Area K building envelope is 2.1 acres. Reducing building envelope for all lots to 0.5-acre, would avoid type conversion of undeveloped forest to suburban forests (which would otherwise be considered a direct loss of forest). The building envelopes for Lots 1 through 4 in Area PQR shall be designed to allow a 30-foot setback from the southern lot boundary. This setback will provide a 30-foot undeveloped buffer between residential development and the southern edge of the residential lots to reduce indirect effects on the nearby Monterey pine forest and Spruance meadow.

Page 3.3-25 Lines 39 to Page 3.3-26 Line 43 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-4. Record ~~negative~~ conservation easements for all retention areas and conduct resource management in accordance with the Master RMP and Site-Specific RMPs. ~~Negative~~ Conservation easements shall be recorded for all retained forest areas outside of approved building and development envelopes to avoid all future loss or conversion of these areas from their present state of undeveloped forest. Language for the ~~negative~~ conservation easements shall be similar in nature to that required for preservation areas as described below for Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-6, including guarantee of funding for resource management by the applicant. Resource management shall be conducted to sustain the existing ecological functions of these areas as discussed above for Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1. Where retention areas are contiguous to other preservation areas that will be dedicated, the retention area shall be dedicated in a conservation easement to the DMFF or an equivalent organization approved by the Planning Director.

The applicant shall be responsible for resource management of all preserved, conserved, and otherwise retained habitat areas that it owns and shall be responsible to fund resource management of retained habitat areas for areas that it currently owns that may be transferred to other parties, such as the residential subdivisions. If the applicant transfers ownership to another party, for properties other than the residential subdivisions, the responsibility for implementing resource management shall shift to the new owner, but the funding responsibility will remain with the applicant. The conservation organization that accepts conservation easements for the retained habitat at the residential subdivisions shall be the recipient of adequate funds to fully implement the Site-Specific Resource Management Plan or plans for the residential subdivision retained habitat areas (open space parcels and areas outside the building envelopes ,. All deed documents for new residential lots shall provide for access to conduct resource management activities and County access to ensure compliance with required permit conditions.

If the DMFF or an equivalent conservation organization is unwilling to accept the conservation easements at the residential subdivisions (F-2, F-3, I-2, K, and PQR), then deed restrictions shall be placed on the residential lots themselves restricting development within the area outside the building envelope.

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-5. Restore Monterey Pine Forest in the proposed 15-acre area at the Proposed Golf Course, evaluate and enhance rural/suburban forest in portions of Area J and the Old Capitol Site, record easements, and conduct resource management in accordance with the Master RMP and Site-Specific RMPs. Restoration of the 15-acre area at the Proposed Golf Course shall consist of establishing native Monterey pines, associated coast live oak, and native understory vegetation (including Yadon's piperia) and maintenance of this area in perpetuity. The applicant shall also evaluate and implement forest enhancement, where feasible, within areas of suburban/rural forest within the existing lots ~~one parcel~~ in Area J (APN 008-022-035) and within two parcels at the Old Capitol Site (portions of parcels 001-761-051 and 001-771-043). The purpose of the enhancement shall be to restore intact pine forest overstory and understory to these areas where suitable and feasible. Enhancement shall not be conducted where both the forest overstory and understory are intact or where other native plant communities are dominant. Enhancement of these areas shall consist of removal of invasives and planting and maintenance of native understory vegetation (including Yadon's piperia where feasible) as well as planting of native Monterey pines if and where appropriate.

Restoration and enhancement activity shall be conducted at the same time as development of the golf course and removal of native forest to allow salvage and transplantation of native forest material (such as native soil and plants). Restoration and enhancement progress will be included in the Annual Work Plan and related monitoring and reporting required by Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1 and discussed further in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (circulated separately with this DEIR). A negative easement shall be required for the restored area at the Proposed Golf Course. The enhancement areas shall be

dedicated in accordance with the requirements noted below in Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-6.

Page 3.3-26 Line 44 through Page 3.3-27 Line 25 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-6. Dedicate conservation easements for all proposed preservation areas (458 acres) and incorporate specific development prohibitions in easements; and provide a guarantee of funding of resource management. The applicant shall be required to dedicate conservation easements for the proposed preservation and conservation areas.

Conservation easements shall be dedicated to the Del Monte Forest Foundation or another appropriate private conservation organization as determined by the Director of the Planning and Building Inspection Department. The easements shall be permanent and irrevocable.

Conservation easements shall contain specific restrictive language that permanently prohibits all future development in the dedication areas. ~~with the following exceptions:~~

- ~~Existing trails and utility uses and their maintenance.~~
- ~~New recreation trails and utility lines proposed with this Proposed Project in the applicant's proposed preservation areas.~~
- ~~Limited expansion of trails, but not expansion of formal recreational facilities, utility lines or corridors, nor construction of any additional supporting facilities.~~

The easements shall also incorporate the following language verbatim:

- "This easement shall only be modified if the revisions are approved by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors at a public hearing."

The easements shall also contain:

- A guarantee of full funding, implementation, and monitoring by the applicant of all agency-approved resource management methods to be established in site-specific RMPs (see Mitigation BIO-B1-1 above).
- A statement that these dedicated areas cannot be used for the mitigation of any other past, present, or future projects.

The intent of this language is to prevent the possibility of later revision, amendment, or interpretive disputes concerning the conservation easements that might directly or indirectly result in the loss of habitat area and quality that is intended and required solely as mitigation for this Project's effects. The intent is also to ensure the implementation of proposed resource management activities that are intrinsic to enhancing and maintaining the forest's values.

Page 3.3-27 Line 27 through 3.3-28 Line 9 are revised as follows:

Impact BIO-C1. Project development could result in potential disturbance and/or indirect impacts to 5.9 acres of wetlands within project development areas, of which 0.3 -acres are designated environmentally sensitive habitat areas, that will be partially offset by dedication of conservation easements in areas containing 4.6 acres of wetlands and restoration and enhancement of wetlands found on development and preservation areas. This is a significant impact that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

A total of 5.9 acres of wetlands occur within the development boundaries of three project development areas (the Proposed Golf Course, the New Equestrian Center, and the Spanish Bay Employee Housing). Approximately 4.6 acres of wetlands also occur within proposed preservation areas (including Area C, H, J, K, L, PQR, and the Corporation Yard Preservation Area) (see Table 3.3-8 in "Environmental Setting" at the end of this section). Wetlands also occur in drainages adjacent to the Congress Road improvements, but not within the footprint of proposed improvements. Wetlands also occur in certain areas in the HHNA along New Equestrian Center utility line alignments.

All these wetlands meet the definition of the Coastal Act; most of the wetlands at the Proposed Golf Course, the Spanish Bay Driving Range, and the New Equestrian Center have been verified as wetlands under USACE jurisdiction. Freshwater marsh wetlands are considered ESHAs under the Del Monte Forest LUP; including Wetland L-2 (0.1 acres) at the Proposed Golf Course, a portion of Wetland S-A at the New Equestrian Center (0.2-acres), and Wetland C-A and C-B (total of 0.8 acres) within a conservation area at the Spanish Bay Driving Range. The man-made wetland at the Spanish Bay Employee Housing location is not considered ESHA.

Page. 3.3-28, Lines 12 through 13 are revised as follows

Pending specific mapping, it appears that grading for Hole 8, the restroom near the 8th green, Hole 10, and/or Hole 11 may infringe on Wetlands A, B, and/or C (EcoSynthesis 2003).

Page 3.3-30, Lines 10 - 28 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-C1-1. Redesign project elements to avoid wetlands to include: redesign of Holes No. 8, 10, and 11 and the golf maintenance trail at the Proposed Golf Course as necessary to avoid all grading disturbance to wetlands; maintain 100-foot buffer for the ESHA-wetland area and a 25-foot buffer for the seasonal wetland area in the lower Sawmill site for all permanent and temporary activity; avoid any utility line encroachment into wetland areas; use a clear-span bridge at the crossing of the drainage north of the New Equestrian Center entrance, and use clear-span bridges, boardwalks, or reroute all new recreational trails that cross wetlands. If necessary, Hole 8, the restroom near the 8th green, Hole 10 and/or Hole 11 should be redesigned such that no direct disturbances, other than those associated with potential restoration and enhancement activities, occur within the identified wetlands. The golf maintenance trail and all pedestrian walkways at the

Proposed Golf Course shall ~~either~~ provide for clear-span bridging, boardwalks or the trails/walkways shall be rerouted to avoid all existing wetlands. Boardwalks shall only be used when the wetland crossing is presently not vegetated; hydrologic connections shall be maintained and improved where feasible. A portion of the Lower Sawmill area wetland is considered an ESHA and shall ~~should~~ be provided with a 100-foot buffer from all proposed activities. The seasonal wetland portion of the Lower Sawmill wetland shall be provided with a 25-foot buffer. A permanent barrier (such as a cable or split-rail fence) shall be placed around the resultant Lower Sawmill wetland buffer to prevent access. The area of hydrophytic vegetation in the drainage north of the New Equestrian Center should be avoided by use of a clear-span bridge.

Table 3.3-4 following Page 3.3-32 is revised as follows (see revised table):

Area F-3 Hooker's Manzanita preserved changed to 8.1 acres.

Page 3.3-44 Lines 37 – 44 and Page 3.3-45 Lines 1-2 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-D3. Provide a habitat management area for Pacific Grove Clover that is as large as the extant population to be identified in 2005 surveys and that contains a 25-foot buffer. Define specific restoration, management and enhancement methods for the Pacific Grove clover population ~~in the Proposed Golf Course location~~ prior to final design of the Proposed Golf Course ~~Hole 8~~, and incorporate these methods into the site-specific RMP, Annual Workplan, and Monitoring Report.

A survey for Pacific Grove Clover shall be conducted in spring 2005 of all potential habitat areas within Area MNOUV, including the entire existing equestrian center, the entire Collins Field, and the driving range. This survey shall be conducted by an independent qualified biologist during the optimal identification period. The identified population extent, in terms of occupied habitat acreage, shall determine the minimum size of the habitat management area. The habitat management area shall be established in a location supporting at least 25% of the population and encompassing at least 25% of the occupied habitat area of Pacific Grove clover in 2005.

If feasible, the habitat management area shall be separate from any fairway, tee, or green, but may be used as a mandatory "fly-over" provided the area is designated out of play. If feasible, a 25-foot buffer area shall be established from the nearest golf course managed green, fairway, tee, or rough in order to reduce herbicide drift and encroachment of golf course grass or rough species. This buffer area may contain Pacific Grove clover plants and habitat, but those plants and habitat shall not be included in the 25% population and 25% habitat minimum amounts required for the habitat management area. The determination of feasibility shall be made by the Director of Planning & Building Inspection based on review of the 2005 surveys, the applicant's proposed golf course design, and the proposed habitat management area.

Revised Table 3.3-4. Summary of Project Impacts on Special Status Plant Species
[NOTE: See PRDEIR Table P2-1 regarding Piperia]

Project Area	~~Yadon's piperia (acres)~~			~~Yadon's Piperia (individuals)~~			Hooker's manzanita (acres)			Hickman's Onion (acres)		
	~~Total~~	~~Disturbed~~	~~Preserved~~	~~Total~~	~~Disturbed~~	~~Preserved~~	Total	Disturbed	Preserved	Total	Disturbed	Preserved
Proposed Golf Course (Area MNOUV)	~~41.8~~	~~21.9~~	~~6.7~~	~~14,730~~	~~7,144 - 8,630 (1)~~	~~3,245~~	1.9	0.5	0.9	<0.1	<0.1	0.0
New Equestrian Center	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~				0.0	0.0	0.0			
Inn at Spanish Bay	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~				0.0	0.0	0.0			
Lodge at Pebble Beach	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~				0.0	0.0	0.0			
Spanish Bay Empl. Housing/Pres. Area B	~~0.6~~	~~0.2~~	~~0.4~~	~~425~~	~~76~~	~~349~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Spanish Bay Driving Range/ Conservation Area C	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Residential Area F-2	~~1.0~~	~~1.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~177~~	~~177~~	~~0~~	18.4	18.4	0.0			
Residential Area F-3/ Conservation Area F-3	~~0.4~~	~~0.1~~	~~0.2~~	~~99~~	~~60~~	~~39~~	16.8	8.7	8.1 ~~8.6~~	<.0.1	0.0	<0.1
Preservation Area G	~~11.8~~	~~0.0~~	~~11.8~~	~~1,579~~	~~0~~	~~1,579~~	33.5	0.0	33.5	<.0.1	0.0	<0.1
Preservation Area H	~~9.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~9.1~~	~~966~~	~~0~~	~~966~~	22.5	0.0	22.5	<.0.1	0.0	<0.1
Preservation Area I-1	~~13.9~~	~~0.0~~	~~13.9~~	~~1,940~~	~~0~~	~~1,940~~	9.8	0.0	9.8	<.0.1	0.0	<0.1
Residential Area I-2	~~0.1~~	~~0.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~32~~	~~27~~	~~0~~	15.6	13.0	0.0			
Preservation Area J	~~0.2~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.2~~	~~102~~	~~0~~	~~102~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Residential Area K	~~1.5~~	~~1.5~~	~~0.0~~	~~1,526~~	~~1,526~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Conservation Area K	~~0.2~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.2~~	~~199~~	~~0~~	~~199~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Preservation Area L	~~0.5~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.5~~	~~321~~	~~0~~	~~321~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Residential Area PQR	~~2.3~~	~~2.3~~	~~0.0~~	~~255~~	~~255~~	~~0~~	3.8	3.8	0.0			
Preservation Area PQR	~~45.9~~	~~0.0~~	~~45.9~~	~~15,643~~	~~0~~	~~15,643~~	25.3	0.0	25.3	5.5	0.0	5.5
Corporation Yard	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Internal Road Improvements	~~Potential~~	~~Potential~~	~~0.0~~	~~Potential~~	~~Potential~~	~~0~~	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highway 1/68	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	**~~129.3~~**	**~~27.2~~**	**~~89.0~~**	**~~37,994~~**	**~~9,265 - 10,751 (1)~~**	**~~24,383~~**	**148.0**	**44.7**	**100.2 ~~100.7~~**	**5.6**	**<0.1**	**5.6**

Sources: County of Monterey 1995, Allen 1996, County of Monterey 1997, Pebble Beach Company Biological Resource Maps, site maps, and resource estimates (PBC 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2003b, 2003d; Zander 2003a, 2003b, 2002b)

(1) Range reflects two different impact estimation methodologies. Lower number reflects assumption of loss of all piperia within mapped piperia areas within mapped disturbance areas at the Proposed Golf Course. Higher number reflects assumption of loss of all piperia within mapped piperia areas that intersect with mapped disturbance areas, e.g. if a polygon of occupied habitat intersects a disturbance area, all of the piperia within the polygon were assumed to be removed.

If it is determined to not be feasible to separate the habitat management area from the golf course proper, the habitat management area may be located in part or in whole within the field of play.

The success criteria for this mitigation will be the same regardless of location, and, as described below, if habitat management within the golf course proper is insufficient to meet the success criteria, then remedial action will be required.

The Site-Specific RMP shall apply the restoration, management, and enhancement methods contained within the applicant's Special Status Species Report (Zander 2001) to the identified habitat management area and shall define implementation steps and timing. Control plots and monitoring regimes shall also be identified in the SSRMP.

The success criterion is to achieve a number of Pacific Grove Clover plants in the management area at MNOUV that is no less than 90% of the population expectation relative to plant counts in the 2005 baseline year when compared to control plots at other Pacific Grove Clover populations (see example in table below).

Site	Baseline # plants in 2005	# plants in 2006	# plants in 2007
Management area	1000	450	500
Control sites (off-site)	600	300	480

In this example, even though the population in the management area in 2006 would be 45% of the 2005 baseline, the success criterion has been met because control sites were found to support 50% of their baseline population and 45% is 90% of 50%. In 2007 the success criterion would not have been met because the management area population would be 50% of the 2005 baseline while the control sites would be at 80% of baseline.

The success criterion is to be met for three successive years after establishment of the habitat management area to achieve initial success. Following demonstrated initial success, the habitat management area shall be monitored every three years over a nine-year period to demonstrate sustained success. The applicant shall be responsible for funding monitoring by an independent third party and management of this area for the minimum 20-year period, and for additional time if determined necessary by Monterey County to sustain this species.

~~Monitoring of habitat expansion or new creation areas (that would be conducted and reported on as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1) shall be conducted to assess the existing population. The success criterion is to achieve a number of plants in the created/expanded habitat management area that is at least 50% of that occurring in the control plots~~

Page 3.3-52 Lines 9 to 12 are revised as follows

CRLF is rare locally and was only recently (WRA 2002a, 2002b, 2003) found on the peninsula. There are only a few known occurrences in the project vicinity (the Drake Pool/Drainage I pond, lower Seal Rock Creek, and nearby Spyglass Hill Golf Course water hazards). The "Drake Pool" is the result of culverted road and equestrian drainage that has created a scour pool immediately under a culvert adjacent to Drake Road.

Page 3.3-53 line 41 through 3.3-54 Line 14 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-D5-4. Design new breeding habitat along Seal Rock Creek in accordance with criteria to establish CRLF habitat characteristics.

The following CRLF habitat characteristics shall be incorporated into the designs for the new breeding ponds:

- Water depth: Ponded water depth should be a maximum of 2 to 3 feet during the wet season, with water present through July.
- Planting locations: A fringe of native species, with a mix of tules and spikerush, should be planted around the perimeter of the ponds.
- Monitoring: Vegetation monitoring should be incorporated with the overall revegetation monitoring plan to ensure that plantings survive. Replanting should occur, if necessary. Sediment removal should be conducted, if required. The minimum monitoring period should be 5 years after planting. A survival rate of 75% after 5 years should be attained before monitoring ceases.
- These standards should be reviewed during preparation of the HCP or BA to verify that they are adequate.

Page 3.3-56 Lines 17 to 22 are revised as follows:

Black or silvery legless lizards. Areas of potential habitat for legless lizards occur in dune habitat on the Proposed Golf Course (Areas M and N) and in Area L. There would be no impacts on legless lizards or their habitat in Area L because this area is proposed for preservation. The coastal dune restoration plan would provide for the protection and enhancement of 33.17 ~~33.49~~ acres of remnant dune habitat on the Proposed Golf Course.

Page 3.3-60 Line 33 to Page 3.3-61 Line 15 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-H1. Conduct preconstruction raptor surveys and establish temporary construction buffers.

Conduct a breeding season survey (typically March 1 through June 30) prior to tree removal or construction activities in all areas (including a ~~100~~ 150-foot buffer) where trees would be removed for construction, resource management, residential development, and infrastructure improvements, or where other construction activities could result in disturbance of nesting raptors.

The breeding season survey would be conducted during the season when trees are to be removed and would be valid only for that season. Subsequent surveys would be required if tree removal is delayed into the next breeding season.

If an active raptor nest is found in any trees to be removed or within the ~~100~~ 150-foot buffer, then the project biologist would establish a site-specific, non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. Tree and vegetation removal can begin when the biologist determines that the nest is no longer being used for that season (typically around June 30).

If no active raptor nests are found in any of the trees to be removed or within a ~~100~~ 150-foot buffer from construction activities, then no further mitigation would be required. In addition, trees can be removed without any mitigation during the nonbreeding season (typically July 1–February 28).

Page 3.3-62, Lines 19 to 21 are revised as follows:

Because of its ~~very~~ small natural range and ~~very~~ large international commercial importance, there is ~~substantial~~ concern regarding conservation of the genetic diversity of Monterey pine.

Page 3.3-64, Lines 1 to 40 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-I1-1. Incorporate specific tree removal and replanting guidelines into the site-specific RMPs. These guidelines shall include the following stipulations.

- Within the 20 -year monitoring period of RMPs, the applicant shall replant on a 1:1 ratio sufficient Monterey pines and coast live oaks to replace the trees removed as part of any portion of the Proposed Project, unless it can be demonstrated that such replanting cannot be accomplished within the Del Monte Forest without compromising the health of native forest areas.

- Removal and disposal techniques for Monterey pine trees infected with pitch canker shall follow principles delineated by the Pitch Canker Task Force.

- As part of the development of site-specific RMPs, assessments shall be conducted for the symptoms of sudden oak death and the presence of the pathogen Phytophthora ramorum. If infection is identified within development areas, the maximum retention of uninfected coast live oaks will be incorporated into the site-specific FMPs and RMPs. If any

infected oaks are identified within areas of oak removal, removal and disposal activity and techniques shall incorporate current best management and control recommendations for pathogen control from the California Oak Mortality Task Force.

- Planting stock must be derived from healthy, mature local trees, preferably growing more than 500 feet from known non-local plantings. A qualified forester or biologist shall make selection of suitable trees for planting stock.
- Seed sources shall be stands that exhibit characteristics similar to those in the target planting areas.
- Where container stock will be used for outplanting of trees, precautions shall be taken to ensure that container soils do not support the pathogens that cause sudden oak death or pine pitch canker,
- Monterey pine forest planting stock shall include pitch canker–resistant individuals from a diverse genetic background. Coast live oak planting stock selection shall follow current recommendations of the California Oak Mortality Task Force, if sudden oak death is identified in any oaks assessed within the Del Monte Forest.
- Treatment of understory, duff, and/or soil shall be carried out at replanting locations as necessary to maximize the vigor and long-term success of mitigation plantings
- A qualified County-approved forester or biologist shall monitor replacement plantings annually during the first 5 years, and every 5 years thereafter up to 20 years as part of the overall monitoring plan.

These guidelines must be followed wherever tree replanting is conducted.

Page 3.3-69 Lines 24 to 27 are revised as follows:

Wetlands are uncommon and important biological resources in the Del Monte Forest. A total of 10.5 acres of wetlands occur within the project area: 5.9 acres within development site boundaries and 4.6 acres within proposed preservation areas ~~A total of 10.3 acres of wetlands occur within the project area: 5.7 acres within development site boundaries and 4.6 acres within proposed preservation areas~~ (see Table 3.3-8 in this chapter and Appendix E).-

Page 3.3-69 Lines 35 to 38 are revised as follows:

The project development areas contain a total of 0.3 acres of freshwater marsh on the Proposed Golf Course and New Equestrian Center at the Sawmill site (EcoSynthesis 2003). Freshwater marshes are also located on several of the proposed preservation areas, containing 1.37 acres.

Table 3.3-8 following Page 3.3-69 is revised as shown in the enclosed revised table.

Page 3.3-70 Lines 11 to 16 are revised as follows:

The project development areas contain 5.5 acres of seasonal wetlands (County of Monterey 1997; WRA 2001; EcoSynthesis 2000 and 2003). These wetlands occur on the Proposed Golf Course, Area B and the Sawmill site. ~~Additional seasonal wetlands occur on the proposed preservation areas~~. According to previously conducted wetland studies, many of these areas appear to have been created by vegetation trampling and road construction. Additional seasonal wetlands (3.2 acres) occur within the proposed preservation areas.

Page 3.3-71 Lines 11 through 18 are revised as follows:

"*Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas* are defined under the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code, Section 30107.5) as:

Areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem, and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. ~~In addition, some of these sensitive habitats require further protection from disturbance, and this subset of sensitive habitats is called environmentally sensitive habitat areas.~~"

Page 3.3-71 Lines 28 through 32 are revised as follows:

Freshwater marshes in the project area are considered ESHA. As noted above, approximately 0.3 acres of freshwater marshes are found within development areas at the Proposed Golf Course and the New Equestrian Center. Additional freshwater marshes (1.4 acres) are found within proposed preservation and conservation areas.

Figure 3.3-3 following Page 3.3-71 is revised as follows (see revised figure).

Corrected boundary for Preservation Area PQR.

Table 3.3-10 following Page 3.3-74 is revised as follows (see revised table).

Revised Table 3.3-8. Summary of Wetlands and Riparian Areas Within Project Areas

Project Area	Freshwater Marsh	Seasonal Wetland	Total Wetland Area	Riparian Linear Feet (LF)
Proposed Golf Course Area (MNOUV)	0.12	4.31	4.43	0
New Equestrian Center (Sawmill)	0.19 ~~1.14~~	1.20 ~~0.25~~	1.39	0
Spanish Bay Employee Housing Preservation Area B	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,147
Spanish Bay Driving Range Conservation Area C	0.81 ~~0.80~~	0.00	0.80	0
Preservation Area H	0.00	1.30	1.30	0
Preservation Area I-1	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,309
Preservation Area J	0.20 ~~0.00~~	0.00 ~~0.20~~	0.20	86
Conservation Area K	0.35 ~~0.00~~	0.00 ~~0.35~~	0.35	400
Preservation Area L	0.01	0.04	0.05	215
Preservation Area PQR	0.00	1.73 ~~1.70~~	1.73 ~~1.70~~	400
Corporation Yard Preservation Area	0.00	0.17	0.17	0
Total in Project Development and Preservation Areas	**1.68** **~~2.63~~**	**8.78** **~~7.83~~**	**10.46**	**4,557**
Subtotal in Project Development Areas	*0.31* *~~1.26~~*	*5.54* *~~4.59~~*	*5.85*	*0*
Subtotal in New Preservation Areas	*1.37*	*3.24*	*4.61* *~~4.59~~*	*4,557*
Existing Preserved Area Huckleberry Hill Natural Area	NA	NA	10.01	0

Sources: EcoSynthesis 2000; EcoSynthesis 2003; WRA 2001; EIP 1997; EIP 1995; WWD, 2002, various correspondence.

Revised Table 3.3-10. Special Status Plant Location Summary by Project Area

[NOTE: For Yadon's Piperia see PRDEIR Table P2-1)

Site	~~Yadon's piperia~~		Hooker's manzanita	Hickman's Onion	Other Special Status Plants
	~~acres~~	~~individuals~~	acres	acres	occurrences
Proposed Golf Course Area (MNOUV)	~~41.8~~	~~14,730~~	1.9	0.02	Pacific grove clover, pine rose, and dune plants (Monterey spineflower, Menzies' wallflower, beach layia, sand gilia, Tidestroms' lupine, and Monterey Indian paintbrush)
New Equestrian Center	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		Pine rose
Inn at Spanish Bay	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Lodge at Pebble Beach	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Spanish Bay Employee Housing and Preservation Area B	~~0.6~~	~~425~~	0.0		
Spanish Bay Driving Range and Conservation Area C	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Preservation Area D	~~1.0~~	~~177~~	N/A ~~18.4~~		Site not surveyed to date
Residential Area F-2	~~0.4~~	~~99~~	18.4 ~~16.8~~		Gowen cypress, pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Residential Area F-3	~~11.8~~	~~1,579~~	16.8 ~~33.5~~	0.01	Gowen cypress, pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area G	~~9.1~~	~~966~~	33.5 ~~22.5~~	0.01	Monterey clover, pine rose
Preservation Area H	~~13.9~~	~~1,940~~	22.5 ~~9.8~~	0.01	Pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area I-1	~~0.1~~	~~32~~	9.8 ~~15.6~~	0.07	Pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Residential Area I-2	~~0.2~~	~~102~~	15.6 ~~0.0~~		Pine rose
Preservation Area J	~~1.5~~	~~1,526~~	0.0		
Residential Area K	~~0.2~~	~~199~~	0.0		
Conservation Area K	~~0.5~~	~~321~~	0.0		
Preservation Area L	~~2.3~~	~~255~~	0.0 ~~3.8~~		Pine rose, Monterey spineflower Monterey Indian paintbrush
Residential Area PQR	~~45.9~~	~~15,643~~	3.8 ~~25.3~~	0.00	Sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area PQR	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	25.3 ~~0.0~~	5.52	Sandmat manzanita (15 occurrences, including significant (ESHA) occurrence.
Internal Road Improvements	~~Potential~~	~~Potential~~	0.4	0.00	
Highway 1/68	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.00	
TOTAL	**~~129.3~~**	**~~37,944~~**	**148.0**	**5.64**	
HHNA/SFB Morse Preserve	~~Not Est.~~	~~7, 578~~	22.8		Gowen cypress and multiple other species
Sources: Allen 1996, EIP 1997, Yadon 2001, WWD 2002, Pebble Beach Company Biological Resource maps 2002, PBC 2003b, 2003d, Zander 2003a and 2003b, 2002b. Area I-1 revised per PBCSD plans for 2.2-acre expansion.					

Chapter 3.4 – Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 3.4-1 Lines 6 to 10 are revised as follows:

It is based on a review of previous technical investigations and environmental studies performed in and immediately adjacent to the Proposed Project area (Balance Hydrologics 2001, Balance Hydrologics 2003, EcoSynthesis 2000 and 2003, PBCSD 2000, Questa Engineering 2003a and 2003b, Wetlands Research Associates 2001, and WWD 2001).

Page 3.4-3 Lines 15 to 16 are revised as follows:

- installing interceptor drains ~~for areas that would cause~~ to minimize additional runoff and to minimize changes in flow to wetlands (e.g., irrigation water for the Proposed Golf Course);

Page 3.4-3 lines 20 to 22 are revised as follows:

- designing stormwater drainage systems including detention and/or retention facilities and bioswales to prevent peak runoff rates from exceeding pre-project conditions and to meet Monterey County stormwater runoff development standards requiring that discharge from the site is no greater than 10-year pre-development peak discharge.

Page 3.4-4 Line 34 through 3.4-5 line 2 are revised as follows:

- North Drainage: This is the area in and around the Spyglass Quarry. Drainage piping will be installed in this area to facilitate flows to natural and man-made swales in conjunction with filter areas. Several detention basins are also proposed to receive golf course drainage. The north drainage drains in a radial pattern out from the raised Spyglass Pit (Balance Hydrologics 2003). A portion drains to Spyglass Hill and a portion drains to Cypress Point. ~~This area drains to Spyglass Hill.~~

Page 3.4-5 lines 8 to 10 are revised as follows:

detention facility before release to the storm drain system. A detention basin (required volume of 0.22 ~~0.17~~ acre-feet volume (Balance Hydrologics 2003) near the 14th hole tees will be installed.

Page 3.4-5 lines 11 to 17 are revised as follows:

- Subwatershed 2: This area includes the northeast and central portion of the Proposed Golf Course. Surface runoff will be captured in a network of V-ditches and underground storm drains that transport water to a detention basin before discharging to a wetland buffer, then a wetland, and then ~~the wetland buffer before being discharged~~ to the off-site storm drain system at Cypress Point. Peak flows will be detained in detention

pond (required volume of 0.52 ~~0.46~~ acre-feet (Balance Hydrologics 2003) volume) near the 3rd hole tees.

Page 3.4-5 lines 32 to 34 are revised as follows:

A detention pond near the 12th fairway (required volume of 0.70 ~~0.85~~ acre-feet (Balance Hydrologics 2003) will be installed to detain these flows prior to discharge to Cypress Point.

Page 3.4-6 Lines 1 to 7 are revised as follows:

New Equestrian Center. Roof drainage will be collected in its own system and channeled to the eastern wetland area. Site drainage will be collected by separate storm drainage and routed to ~~a~~ two detention basins on-site. Overflow from the easternmost basin will discharge to a bioswale prior to release to the wetland area. Overflows from the westernmost basins will flow overland to the outlet culvert. ~~Overflow from the detention basin will be discharged to an exiting drainage ditch (Questa 2003a and 2003b). In addition, the applicant has proposed biofilters/swales upgradient of the large wetland in the lower Sawmill site to reduce flow energy and filter stormwater prior to entering the wetland.~~

Page 3.4-7 Lines 18to 20 are revised as follows:

Corporation Yard Employee Housing. ~~The preliminary drainage report did not include this proposed development. The s~~ Site plans show that the employee housing will drain to the existing detention basin, which will be enlarged to accommodate the additional runoff.

Page 3.4-7 Line 20, the following is added after line 20

Phase 1B Improvements to Highway 1/Highway 68/17 Mile Drive interchange.

A Conceptual Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (Mark Thomas 2001) has been prepared for the Phase 1B improvement. The SWPPP includes: pollutant source identification; BMP selection; BMP maintenance inspection and repair; and post-construction stormwater management.

Page 3.4-9 Lines 23 to 26 are revised as follows:

Peak flow analyses using the rational ~~rationale~~ method was conducted by Balance Hydrologics for the watersheds containing wetlands at the Proposed Golf Course, the New Equestrian Center, the Spanish Bay Driving Range, and the Spanish Bay Employee Housing. In particular, peak flow rates are predicted to substantially

Page 3.4-13 Lines 37 through 3.4-15 Line 13 are revised as follows:

Impact HWQ-C1. The Proposed Project may degrade surface water quality due to an increase in sediment and pollutant loading in stormwater drainage. The applicant's BMP plan, and Watershed Hydrology Report and the Conceptual SWPPP for the Phase 1B improvements include measures that are effective at reducing contamination and sediment loading in runoff. This is a less-than-significant impact.

This impact discussion covers general impacts concerning stormwater runoff related to erosion, general site runoff (including paved areas and parking lots), and runoff from residential areas. Construction-period stormwater runoff is discussed under Impact HWQ-C6. Site-specific impacts are addressed individually as follows:

- pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers (Impact HWQ-C2);
- equestrian center animal waste (Impact HWQ-C3);
- reclaimed water use (Impact HWQ-C4);
- Carmel Bay Area of Special Biological Significance (Carmel Bay ASBS) (Impact HWQ-C5); and

As described above, the Proposed Project will increase rates and quantities of stormwater drainage. Increases in the total runoff volume can accelerate soil erosion and stream channel scour, and can increase the transport of contaminants to waterways. The development plans (PBC 2002) include a variety of drainage improvements, including detention basins to reduce the size of peak drainage flow rates during storm events, that were described under "Project Characteristics." These basins will also provide water quality benefits by allowing settling of sediment particles and reducing their transport.

The project will also involve the construction of roads, parking lots, infrastructure and maintenance areas associated with the proposed facilities. Runoff from these areas can be expected to contain non-point pollution sources comparable to that from urban areas. The types of pollutants contained in street/parking lot runoff include oil, grease, heavy metals, and other petroleum derivatives from engines; and the wearing of auto part and roadway surfaces. New parking lots are proposed at all development sites, except the residential areas and Highway 1/68 interchange. The applicant has proposed in the BMP plan to utilize oil and grease/sediment traps, ~~oils and grease sediment traps~~, vegetated filtering strips and swales, and detention-retention systems to control these pollutant sources (Questa 2003a and 2003b). The applicant has conducted stormwater runoff sampling in the Del Monte Forest since 1995. Sampling stations are identified in Table 3.4-1 in the Existing Setting below. To date, no oil and grease has been detected in any sampling events.

The increase in the number of permanent residential units will also incrementally increase the potential for common household materials such as pesticides; fertilizers; automotive fluids (e.g., fuel, oil, grease, antifreeze, brake pad dust); cleaning agents; and pet wastes to enter storm runoff. In addition to detention structures at residential areas discussed above, the BMP Plan also includes incorporating litter control and street sweeping of all new paved areas into its existing street sweeping program, with particular emphasis on the time period immediately prior to the rainy season.

Among other relevant water quality recommendations, the Watershed Hydrology Report also recommends that where roof runoff is diverted directly to wetlands and buffers, selection of benign roofing materials is warranted. Roofing materials containing copper, chromium arsenate, asbestos, and zinc are not recommended. Concrete, wood, paints, and coatings (such as fire-retardants) are recommended for evaluation for toxicity (Balance Hydrologics 2003). Development sites that drain to wetlands and buffers include the Proposed Golf Course, the New Equestrian Center, the Spanish Bay Driving Range, and the Spanish Bay Employee Housing.

With the implementation of the mitigations noted above (HWQ B1-1, and HWQ B1-2) regarding stormwater drainage infrastructure, as well as all of the measures contained in the BMP plan (Questa, 2003a) and the Watershed Hydrology Report (Balance Hydrologics 2003) and the Conceptual SWPPP for the Phase 1B improvement, this impact is considered *less-than-significant*. The measures in the BMP plan and the Watershed Hydrology Report and the Conceptual SWPPP are considered part of the Proposed Project and thus all measures contained therein concerning water quality are considered mandatory by the County.

Page. 3.4-16, Line 33 to 3.4-18 Line 29 is revised as follows

Impact HWQ-C3. Horse waste at the New Equestrian Center could degrade water quality in downstream wetlands and drainages. Impacts at the Center can be effectively reduced by implementation of the measures found in the applicant's BMP plan with additional mitigation measures for special events. Increased trail use may result in increased nutrient loading in HHNA drainages and wetlands. This is a significant impact that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Concentrated use of the New Equestrian Center may generate substantial quantities of animal wastewater and manure solids. Ground surfaces in equine exercise areas can also become trampled and muddy during the rainfall season, and contribute to off-site transport of sediment and other contaminants. These wastes contain elevated levels of nutrients, inorganic salts, oxygen-demanding substances, and pathogenic organisms. Off-site transport of wastes in stormwater runoff may adversely impact the quality of receiving waters of the local Sawmill Gulch watershed and Pacific Ocean. These effects could occur during routine operations and during special events.

Development plans (PBC 2001) specify that the facility will have separate roof

runoff and storm drainage systems installed and the storm drains will outfall to a grass buffer area upstream of a wetland. Exposure of facilities to stormwater during the winter rainfall season would constitute the primary transport mechanisms for contaminants of concern.

The BMP plan includes the following elements for waste management at the site.

- Solid manure and liquid waste will be managed daily through stockpiling and disposal procedures and policies. Manure and bedding wastes will be removed daily from outside areas exposed to rainfall and runoff. Manure will be stored under cover at a dedicated bunker area and transported at least twice weekly to a landfill or other approved disposal facility. [Note: although not noted in the BMP plan, another acceptable use for manure would be as natural fertilizer by organic farms].

- Roof runoff will be discharged to the drainage system to avoid transporting contaminants near barns, stalls, paddocks, rings, and exercise areas.

- A detention basin will be installed near the wetland to reduce the potential for direct discharge of contaminants to the wetland, and to maximize the effectiveness and functioning of the grass filter strip area adjacent to the wetland.

- Water used as washwater and for animal watering will be managed to minimize fly and mosquito breeding habitat.

The BMP plan does not explicitly note that these measures would be applied during special events, during which hundreds of visiting horses would be stabled and active at the site, particularly in the Lower Sawmill area. While the facility design of the center itself would address activity within the permanent facilities in the upper Sawmill, the BMP plan does not describe measures that would be implemented in the lower Sawmill during equestrian special events.

With the implementation of 1) the applicant's proposed drainage improvements including detention and retention facilities, buffers, and biofilters/swales, 2) mitigation noted above concerning wetlands, 3) mitigation above concerning stormwater drainage infrastructure, 4) mitigation measures noted in Chapter 3.3 "Biological Resources" concerning wetlands and, 5) all of the measures contained in the BMP plan (Questa, 2003a), the impact at the Center during routine operations itself is considered *less-than-significant*. The measures in the BMP plan are considered part of the Proposed Project and thus all measures contained therein concerning animal waste management are considered mandatory by the County. The impact during special events, particularly concerning the Lower Sawmill, while reduced by the measures noted above, would still be considered potentially significant, and mitigation is proposed below to apply appropriate BMPs to special event activity.

Trail use will increase primarily in the HHNA including SFB Morse Preserve. As

noted above, water quality in wetlands near the existing equestrian center has apparently been affected by animal waste, both on the premises and along trails near the center. In particular, the BMP plan (Questa 2003a and 2003b) and the Wetland Management Plan (WRA 2001) both suggest that existing elevated nitrogen levels in some of the wetlands at the Proposed Golf Course may be influenced by animal waste along equestrian trails close to the wetlands. All four drainages in HHNA are crossed by existing trails and two would be crossed by the new trail along the Haul Road. Some trail segments also cross adjacent to existing wetlands in HHNA. Thus, increased equestrian use along HHNA trails could result in increased nutrient loading into HHNA drainages and wetlands. The BMP plan does not include any measures related to animal waste along trails where equestrian use will increase as a result of relocation of the Equestrian Center.

Impacts related to potential erosion and sedimentation due to increased trail use in the HHNA are addressed in Chapter 3.4, "Biological Resources," under Impact BIO-A5.

This is a *significant* impact that can be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level by the following mitigation.

Mitigation Measure HWQ-C3. Implement stream and wetland water quality monitoring, and identify and implement additional measures if monitoring shows a substantial increase in nutrients resulting from animal waste along trails in Huckleberry Hill Natural Area. <u>Implement Best Management Practices for control of horse waste during special events.</u>

The applicant shall monitor the water quality of HHNA drainages and wetlands in proximity to areas of increased equestrian trail use. Monitoring shall be conducted prior to opening of the New Equestrian Center to establish a baseline by which to evaluate project-related changes. Monitoring shall be conducted three times annually for nutrients related to animal waste (nitrogen and ammonia in particular), to include the fall, after the first major storm, and in the spring. Monitoring results shall be submitted to Monterey County. If results indicate that a substantial increase in nutrients is resulting from increased equestrian trail use, the applicant shall identify adaptive management strategies to protect water quality. These measures may include periodic cleanup of animal waste near drainages, rerouting trail drainage away from streams and wetlands, reconfiguring trails to avoid intensive use in problem areas, manure bags, and/or other measures. Monitoring shall be conducted every year for 5 years and then every 5 years for a minimum of 15 years and until analytic results demonstrate that adaptive management measures have effectively reduced nutrient loading to background levels.

<u>The Site-Specific Resource Management Plan for the New Equestrian Center and the HHNA shall contain the following Best Management Practices for control of horse waste during special events:</u>

- <u>Bedding (i.e., shavings and/or straw) shall be placed in all temporary</u>

stable facilities, including sleeping and washing areas, during special events. Manure and bedding waste shall be collected from temporary stable facilities within one day of the end of the special event and transported to an approved disposal facility or for use off-site at organic farms as fertilizer.

- Solid manure waste in special event outdoor use areas shall be removed daily. Manure may be stored under cover at a dedicated bunker area and transported at the end of the special event to an approved disposal facility.

- Temporary stable facilities shall not be located within 100-feet of the wetland in the Lower Sawmill.

- The detention basin to be installed near the wetland and the grass filter strip area (per the BMP plan) shall also be designed to contain runoff from temporary stables and temporary special event use areas. During special events, the detention basin shall operate as a containment basin and shall not drain into the wetland and Sawmill Gulch. Instead, the detention basin shall be cleaned out after the end of each special event and the accumulated material transported to an approved disposal facility or for use off-site at organic farms as fertilizer. Only after the basin is cleaned out, shall drainage again be routed into the wetland and Sawmill Gulch.

Figure 3.4-1 following Page 3.4-24 is revised as follows (see revised figure).

Corrected boundary for Preservation Area PQR.

Page 3.4-25 Lines 36 to 38 are revised as follows:

- North Drainage: This is the area in and around the Spyglass Quarry. A portion of this area drains through small gullies to the Spyglass Hill drainage system and a portion drains to Cypress Point. This area does not contain any wetlands.

Page 3.4-29 Lines 5 to 6 are revised as follows:

However, nitrate values of 1 to 1.5 mg/L (as nitrogen) and Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (ammonia and organic nitrogen) values of 11 to 12 mg/L have been measured in adjacent surface drainages. ~~However, inorganic nitrate and ammonia values have been detected in adjacent surface drainage samples up to about 12 mg/L.~~

Chapter 3.5 – Public Services and Utilities

Page 3.5-3 Lines 14 to 16 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would relocate six existing trail segments and create ten new trail segments resulting in an additional 2.4 miles of trails, for a total of 31.4 miles. Trails are not necessarily newly constructed as most will use existing fire roads. ~~existing trail segments and construct ten new trail segments resulting in an additional 3.6 miles of trails for a total of 32.5 miles.~~

Page 3.5-6, Lines 5 to 13 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would increase demand for fire and first-responder emergency medical services. PBCSD has an ongoing improvement program to provide increased fire protection benefits in the Proposed Project area (Estrada, pers. comm.). The current staffing, equipment, and facilities are adequate to provide acceptable service ratios and response times and are not anticipated to change substantially with implementation of the Proposed Project. The automatic aid agreement with the cities of ~~Carmel,~~ Pacific Grove and Monterey has also improved the ability to provide fire protection and first-responder medical emergency services to the Proposed Project area.

Page. 3.5-7, Lines 27 to 37 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure PSU-A2: The applicant and the Sheriff's Department shall develop a funding mechanism to insure that adequate funding is available for police service within the Del Monte Forest. This funding shall be sufficient to cover the cost of one additional Deputy for the Monterey County Sheriff in perpetuity. The Sheriff's Office has determined that the impact on police services can be mitigated by the applicant making funding allocations for one (1) additional Deputy in perpetuity. This determination is made based upon the recommendation contained in the draft General Plan and the standard of one (1) patrol officer per 1,000 population. The County's standard of 1 officer per 1000 residents is a guideline and should be tempered by unique circumstances such as community demographics and the existence of private security services. The funding mechanism shall not in any way constitute a levy on existing Del Monte Forest residents. One potential source of revenue ~~is the transient occupancy tax~~. could be a surcharge on new hotel visitors; another could be an assessment on new residents of the subdivisions proposed by the applicant. A determination by the County that the increase in County tax revenue as a result of the Proposed Project would also be sufficient to allow for perpetual funding of one additional Deputy would also meet this mitigation requirement.

Page. 3.5-18, Lines 11 to 34 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure PSU-G1. Coordinate with the appropriate utility service providers and related agencies to reduce service interruptions. The applicant would coordinate with the appropriate utility service providers and related

agencies to reduce service interruptions. This coordination would include the following:

- The applicant would contact the Underground Service Alert (800/642-2444) at least 48 hours before excavation work begins to verify the nature and location of existing underground utilities. The applicant would also notify all public and private utility owners at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of work adjacent to any exiting utility, unless the excavation permit specifies otherwise.

- The applicant would coordinate with Cal Am as the water purveyor and PBCSD Fire Department to minimize or eliminate potential water interruptions. Such coordination efforts may include requiring the construction contractor to "hot-tap" existing water lines for new water line connections when possible to maintain service of existing water lines, and isolate construction areas and backfeed water through alternate lines to provide continuous service.

- The applicant would coordinate with PBCSD, as the sewer agency, to minimize or eliminate potential interruptions of service when connections are made between existing and new sewer lines. Efforts may include coordination with the construction contractor to bypass sewage flows in the affected areas through use of a portable pipeline that connects to unaffected sewage lines.

- The applicant would coordinate with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), as the gas and electric utility purveyor, to minimize or eliminate potential gas and electric service interruptions.

- The applicant would coordinate with SBC (formerly Pacific Bell), as the phone service provider, to minimize or eliminate potential phone service interruptions.

Page 3.5-19 lines 30 to 31 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would add a golf course facility and 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of trails to the Del Monte Forest as well as preserving several hundred acres of open space.

Page. 3.5-20, the following is added after Line 17:

Related to the residential subdivisions, as a condition of approval, the applicant shall comply with Section 19.12.010-Recreation Requirements, of the Subdivision Ordinance, Title 19, Monterey County Code, by paying a fee in lieu of land dedication. The Parks Department shall determine the fee in accordance with provisions contained in Section 19.12.010(D)

Related to the Spanish Bay Employee Housing and the Corporate Yard Employee housing, the applicant shall comply with Section 19.12.010 -

Recreation Requirements, of the County Subdivision Ordinance, Title 19, Monterey County Code, by dedicating land and recreation improvements in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 19.12.010(D) for park and recreation purposes reasonably serving the employee residents.

Chapter 3.6 - Aesthetics

Page 3.6-17 Lines 32 to 33 are revised as follows:

Figures 2.0-10 and 2.0-11 ~~2.0-18 and 2.0-19~~ in Chapter 2.0 show the proposed layout of the New Equestrian Center facilities.

Page 3.6-18 Lines 20 to 23 are revised as follows:

A limited amount of tree removal (52 Monterey pines) and grading would occur in conjunction with the development. In Chapter 2.0, Figures 2.0-12 and 2.0-13 ~~2.0-15 and 2.0-16~~ show detailed plan ~~and elevation~~ drawings for the proposed Spanish Bay Resort improvements.

Page 3.6-18 Lines 45 to 46 are revised as follows:

Approximately 2,000 trees (1,424 Monterey pines and 558 ~~585~~ Coast live oaks) would be removed.

Page 3.6-19 Lines 33 to 35 are revised as follows:

Figures 2.0-16 through 2.0-21 ~~2.0-9 through 2.0-14~~ in Chapter 2.0, show plans and elevation drawings for the proposed Lodge at Pebble Beach improvements.

Page 3.6-19 Lines 43 to 44 are revised as follows:

A partially underground parking garage and about 23 ~~20~~ additional surface parking spaces would be constructed at the parking area.

Page 3.6-27 Lines 19 to 22 are revised as follows:

The existing Pebble Beach Corporation Yard is developed with offices, a vehicle maintenance building, indoor and outdoor storage, and an ongoing rock/decomposed granite operation, which is scheduled to cease at the end of 2004 ~~2003~~.

Chapter 3.7 – Transportation and Circulation

Summary Table following Page 3.7-2 is revised as shown in the revised table below.

Page 3.7-3 Lines 32 to 33 are revised as follows:

These improvements are shown on Figure 2.0-30 ~~2.0-3~~ in Chapter 2.0, "Project Description."

Figure 3.7-3 following Page 3.7-6 has been revised to show the portion of Bristol Curve proposed to be removed.

Page 3.7-24, Line 25 through 45, are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-B1-1. The applicant shall fund a traffic study and the installation of one of four traffic improvement operations ~~a traffic signal~~ at the intersection of Highway 68/Skyline Forest Drive and be reimbursed through an impact fee program for that portion beyond the project's contribution. The applicant shall fund a traffic study and submit it to Caltrans, Monterey County, and the City of Monterey to select one of four options described below to be implemented at the intersection of Highway 68/Skyline Forest Drive. The four options and a preliminary rough estimate of their cost is noted below:

- increase the curb return radius at the northeast corner of the intersection ($12,960);
- formalize existing lane channelization to construct a westbound Highway 68 right run lane ($84,455);
- construct a westbound right-turn acceleration lane ($104,650); or
- installation of the traffic signal ($200,000).

Selection of the preferred option shall be conducted by a consensus of the three agencies as to which option would provide the greatest alleviation of critical side-street traffic movements along Skyline Drive. Any one of these mitigations is considered to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

~~This intersection is not presently included in the Traffic Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) Regional Traffic Impact Fee Program. It is the intention of Monterey County to request the inclusion of this intersection in the impact fee program to allow for collection of fair-share fees from other projects that contribute traffic at this intersection. If the intersection cannot be included in the TAMC impact fee program,~~

IMPACT TOPIC	GC	EC	SBI	SBE	SBR	PBL	SUB	CY	RD	HWY
A. LOS Decrease to Unacceptable Levels										
1. Project would decrease acceptable LOS to unacceptable level at one intersection.	⦿ – Applies to project as a whole. (Congress Road/Forest Lodge Road)									
2. Project would decrease levels of service on internal roads due to special event traffic	⦿	○	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
B. Traffic Increase to Existing Unacceptable Levels										
1. Project will contribute substantial traffic to three intersections currently operating at unacceptable LOS, which will degrade LOS.	⦿ – Applies to project as a whole. (Hwy 68/Skyline Forest Dr, Hwy 68/Beverly Manor~~, Hwy 68/Aguajito Rd~~)									
2. Project will contribute traffic to Highway 68 west of Highway 1, which will be offset by Highway 1/68 improvements.	○ – Applies to project as a whole.									
C. Del Monte Forest Gates										
1. Project will increase traffic at Del Monte Forest gates due to daily traffic.	○ – Applies to project as a whole.									
2. Project will increase traffic at Del Monte Forest gates due to special events.	⦿	⦿	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
D. Access and Circulation.										
1. through 8. The project would create roadways that may not meet design criteria or would create unsafe traffic movements	⦿	⦿	○	⦿	⦿	⦿	⦿	⦿	—	—
E. Parking										
1. Project sites provide adequate parking per County standards.	○	○	○	○	○	○	—	○	—	—
2. Project special event parking will be removed at the existing Equestrian Center	⦿	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
F. Transit & Bicycle Travel										
1. Project is inconsistent with Del Monte Forest LUP alternative transportation policies and the County trip reduction ordinance	⦿– Applies to project as a whole.									
2. Bicycle lanes on Stevenson Drive would be altered but accommodated by project road improvements.	○	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
G. Construction Traffic										
1. Construction traffic would result in short-term increases that would affect existing levels of service and intersection operations	⦿ – Applies to project as a whole									

● = Significant Unavoidable Impact

⦿ = Significant Impact that can be Mitigated to Less-than-Significant

○ = Less than Significant Impact

— = No Impact or Not Applicable to the development site

GC – Golf Course; **EC** – Equestrian Center; **SBI** – Inn at Spanish Bay; **SBE** – Spanish Bay Employee Housing; **SBR** – Spanish Bay Driving Range; **PBL** – The Lodge at Pebble Beach; **SUB** – Residential Subdivisions; **CY** – Corporation Yard Employee Housing; **HWY** – Highway 1/Highway 68/17-Mile Drive Improvement; **RD** – Roadway Improvements

The County will establish a separate program to allow for collection of fair-share fees. In the interim, the applicant shall fund the traffic study and installation of the selected traffic improvement ~~traffic signal~~ so as to allow the implementation of the mitigation, and be reimbursed through an agreement to be negotiated between the County and the applicant. ~~A preliminary rough estimate of the cost of this traffic signal ($200,000) was made by Higgins & Associates (actual cost may vary).~~ Based on ~~this~~ the preliminary rough estimates and the project's contribution to traffic at this intersection (average of 2.0% of morning and evening peak hour total baseline plus project volumes) (~~average of 14% for morning and evening peak hour baseline plus project increase in volume~~), the applicant's fair-share could range between $300 and $4,500 ~~would be approximately $28,500.~~ The applicant's ultimate fair-share contribution will be determined based on 2% of the cost of the traffic study and 2% of the cost estimate for the selected improvement, which will be identified in the required traffic study.

Page 3.7-25, Line 9 -21 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-B1-2. The applicant shall pay a fair-share proportion of the project identified in the Caltrans Project Study Report for Highway 68 between Highway 1 and 0.2 km west of the CHOMP intersection. The cost of the Phase 1B improvements represents approximately 10% of the cost of the Highway 68 PSR project. Applicant funding of Phase 1B will provide for more than a fair-share of the project's impact to Highway 68 between Highway 1 and west of the CHOMP intersection, including the Highway 68/Beverly Manor intersection.

~~**Cost [to] install a traffic signal at the intersection of Highway 68/Beverly Manor.** As noted in Appendix C, this measure was also called for in the Caltrans PSR for the Highway 68 widening. Highway 1/68 improvements are also included in the newly adopted TAMC Regional Impact Fee program. Thus, this mitigation should be implementable through contribution by the applicant into an established program. A preliminary rough estimate of the cost of this traffic signal ($200,000) was made by Higgins & Associates (actual cost may vary). Based on this preliminary rough estimate and the project's contribution to traffic at this intersection (average of 12% for morning and evening peak hour baseline plus project increase in volume), the applicant's fair-share would be approximately $23,500.~~

Page 3.7-25 Line 22 through p. 3.7-26 Line 9 are revised as follows:

Highway 68/Aguajito Road. Under baseline plus project conditions, the Proposed Project would not exacerbate existing failed operations (i.e., LOS F) for the critical side street or critical turn movement at the Highway 68/Aguajito Road intersection during the morning or evening peak hour. Although no project traffic is anticipated to be added directly to the critical side-street movement, project traffic could further minimize the size and availability of gaps in mainline Highway 68 traffic that would be sufficient for traffic movements onto Highway 68.

Analysis Scenario	Control Delay (Aguajito Approach)	Level of Service (Aguajito Approach)
AM Peak Hour		
Existing	14.1	B
Baseline	15.4	B
Baseline + Project	15.7	C
Cumulative	17.2	C
Cumulative + Project	17.6	C
PM Peak Hour		
Existing	20.8	C
Baseline	26.5	D
Baseline + Project	26.8	D
Cumulative	32.0	D
Cumulative + Project	34.0	D
Source: Fehr & Peers 2004b		

1

Analysis Scenario	Control Delay (Left-Turn from Aguajito)	Level of Service (Aguajito Approach)
AM Peak Hour		
Existing	18.5	B
Baseline	21.0	B
Baseline + Project	21.7	B
Cumulative	24.3	C
Cumulative + Project	25.3	C
PM Peak Hour		
Existing	30.9	D
Baseline	40.5	E
Baseline + Project	43.5	E
Cumulative	54.5	F
Cumulative + Project	58.9	F
Source: Fehr & Peers 2004b		

However, critical side-street movement at this intersection under baseline plus project conditions would operate at an LOS C and LOS D during the peak hours and the critical left-turn movement from Aguajito Road would operate at LOS B and LOS E during the peak hours (Fehr & Peers 2004b). Side-street operations are not considered deficient unless they are failing (e.g. LOS F). Thus, in the baseline plus project condition, this is considered a ~~*potentially significant*~~ impact ~~but would be reduced to~~ *less-than-significant* impact~~. with implementation of the following mitigation measure.~~ The reader is referred to Chapter 4.4, where mitigation is identified for project contribution to cumulative impacts at this intersection.

~~**Mitigation Measure TC-B1-3. The applicant shall fund the installation of a median acceleration lane at the intersection of Highway 68/Aguajito Road and be reimbursed through an impact fee program for that portion beyond the project's contribution.** The installation of a median acceleration lane would allow refuge for vehicles turning left out of Aguajito Road from traffic on eastbound Highway 68 and the northbound Highway 1 on-ramp. Signalization is not recommended at this location, due to both the relatively low traffic volumes on the Aguajito Road approach and the close proximity of the northbound Highway 1 on- and off-ramps. This intersection is not presently included in the TAMC Regional Impact Fee Program. It is the intention of Monterey County to request the inclusion of this intersection in the impact fee program to allow for collection of fair-share fees from other projects that contribute traffic at this intersection. If the intersection cannot be included in the TAMC impact fee program, the County will establish a separate program to allow for collection of fair-share fees. In the interim, the applicant shall fund the installation of the acceleration lane so as to allow the implementation of the mitigation, and be reimbursed through an agreement to be negotiated between the County and the applicant. A preliminary rough estimate of the cost of this traffic signal ($200,000) was made by Higgins & Associates (actual cost may vary). Based on this preliminary rough estimate and the project's contribution to traffic at this intersection (average of 17% for morning and evening peak hour baseline plus project increase in volume), the applicant's fair-share would be approximately $33,500.~~

Page 3.7-28, Line 43 through 3.7-29 Line 15 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-C2. During major equestrian center special events, the applicant and special events sponsors shall implement special event procedures to accommodate increased vehicle and trailer traffic at the S.F.B. Morse Gate and the stacking lane from westbound Highway 68.

The applicant and/or equestrian special event sponsors shall provide bus service to and from off-site parking lots, schedule start and end times outside of peak travel times, coordinate with CHP and Monterey County Sheriff to help direct trailer and vehicle traffic, and operate the S.F.B Gate with expedited procedures

for special event attendees as needed to help accommodate spectator and trailer traffic for equestrian special events.

If these measures are insufficient to handle special-event traffic without significant delays, the applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans, to add "conditional" service of the Highway 68/S.F.B. Morse Drive signal whereby the left turn movement can be serviced more frequently than once during a cycle. If this measure is necessary, the applicant shall be responsible for any associated cost to upgrade the signal controller.

The special event traffic procedures shall also establish practices necessary to facilitate emergency evacuation of the New Equestrian Center and to facilitate potential use of Highway 68 as an evacuation route for Pacific Grove if such a need were to arise at the same time as a special event.

Page 3.7-30, Lines 23 through 34 are revised as follows:

Emergency Access. Emergency vehicle responsiveness between the fire station on Forest Lake Road and the residential areas west of the Proposed Golf Course site would be maintained with the projected road closures. With the Proposed Project, only the third emergency access corridor (Stevenson Drive - Ondulado Road - Alva Lane - Portola Road - Sombria Lane) would remain while the other two corridors would be removed. The PBCSD has indicated that the response time from the Forest Lake/Lopez fire station would increase from approximately 4.5 to 5.5 minutes with the road closures. This compares to a ~~7.5~~ 5-minute response time to the Inn at Spanish Bay. The Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD) goal is to attain ~~bring all~~ response times less than 5 minutes 90 percent of the time ~~to under 8 minutes~~. The expected 5.5-minute response time for this area is within the overall PBCSD goal and is, therefore, considered a *less-than-significant* impact."

Page 3.7-37 lines 30 to 33 are revised as follows:

In total, the net change in parking at The Inn at Spanish Bay is expected to be 533 parking spaces. Parking spaces added through development of the Proposed Project would create a surplus of 68 spaces ~~59 spaces~~ beyond County requirements (see Table 3.7-13).

Page 3.7-39 Lines 13 to 14 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project includes approximately 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of new trails that will increase non-motorized connections in the Del Monte Forest.

Page 3.7-42, Lines 10 to 22 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-G1-2: The construction contractor shall implement traffic control measures. A set of comprehensive traffic control measures that address roadways, bikeways, and multi-use trails will be prepared before issuance of building permits. These measures include scheduling of major truck

trips and deliveries to avoid special event activity in the Del Monte Forest. Lane closure procedures, including signs, cones, and other warning devices for drivers, will be identified as appropriate. Use of steel plates to maintain through traffic on roads will be considered and construction access routes will be identified. Trail crossings will be identified with warning devices, and trail detours will be established as appropriate. Construction staging is anticipated to occur on site for all project components and will be verified. On-site parking will be provided for all construction workers to minimize the impact on area roads. When on-site parking cannot be provided, alternative parking and shuttle systems will be developed and verified. The applicant shall require, as a condition of all contracts for construction of the Proposed Project, that contractor personnel are required to obey all existing speed limits within and outside the Del Monte Forest.

Page 3.7-42, Line 30 – 41 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-G1-4. The applicant shall implement the Highway 1/68/17-Mile improvements, the Lopez/Congress intersection, and the Congress Road improvements early in the overall construction schedule. To address the implication of construction worker traffic on the surrounding road system, the Highway 1/68/17 interchange improvements should be in-place within 6 to 12 months of beginning construction on the developments included in the Proposed Project. With this mitigation measure in place, traffic flow in and out of the Del Monte Forest, as well as traffic flow through the Highway 68/Highway 1 interchange, would improve over current deficient conditions.

The applicant shall exhibit all due diligence to: 1) Construction of Phase 1B shall commence within 60 days after obtaining approvals from Caltrans and any other agency with permit jurisdiction over the project and shall be completed no later than two years after approval by the Board of Supervisors; and 2) Complete such construction in a diligent manner consistent with good engineering and construction practices and the requirements of all such permits and approvals.

The applicant shall provide a development timeline within one month after project approval and submit monthly progress reports through project completion. The reporting of any delay in schedule which would preclude the attainment of the required dates shown above should be accompanied by supporting documentation from Caltrans verifying the necessity for this delay.

Should construction of Phase 1B improvements not be completed after the first 12 months of construction of the project, construction related traffic along Highway 68 shall be limited to non-peak hours (defined as 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.) to be monitored by a third party consultant funded by the applicant.

The proposed improvements at the intersection of Lopez and Congress and the Congress Road improvements shall be in place within 6 – 12 months of beginning construction on the developments included in the Proposed Project in order to further construction traffic safety at these locations.

Chapter 3.8 – Air Quality

Page 3.8-1 lines 12–19 are revised as follows:

The existing setting for air quality is presented at the end of this Chapter, starting on page 3.8-10.

Pollutants analyzed in this section include:

- ozone and the ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides [NO_x] and reactive organic gases [ROG]);
- carbon monoxide (CO);
- nitrogen dioxide (NO_2);
- sulfur dioxide (SO_2);
- particulate matter smaller than 10 microns (PM_{10}); and
- toxic air contaminants (TAC).

Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} were calculated based on trip generation rates, average trip lengths, daily traffic volumes, and average traffic speeds using the URBEMIS2001 model. CO impacts were evaluated using a screening procedure based on guidelines provided by Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). Pursuant to these guidelines, the intersection identified as having the greatest traffic impact resulting from the Proposed Project (Highway 1/68 Intersection) was selected ~~picked~~ for the screening procedure for CO analysis. The construction emissions analysis was based on guidelines provided by MBUAPCD (MBUAPCD 2002).

Page 3.8-2 Lines 4 to 7 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would result in new development at 13 sites, including construction of a new 18-hole golf course, a new driving range, 160 new visitor-serving suites and 60 ~~62~~ employee housing units.

Page 3.8-5 Lines 2 through 17 are revised as follows:

Impact AIR-B1: The project would result in a long-term increase in ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM_{10} emissions due to vehicular traffic generated by development, but would not exceed air quality standards of daily emissions thresholds. This is a less-than-significant impact.

The primary operational emissions associated with the Proposed Project are ozone precursors, CO, and PM_{10} emitted as area sources (natural gas, fireplace and landscape fuel consumption) and vehicle exhaust. This project would not

create new stationary sources that would result in air emissions. Daily emissions were estimated using URBEMIS assumptions for residential and hotel unit use, CARB Emission Standards for landscape equipment unit use, and traffic data prepared for this project (Fehr & Peers 2002) for traffic–related emissions. The Proposed Project's land uses would generate motor-vehicle trips that would in turn generate operational air emissions. Traffic emission calculations for with-project conditions are based on the daily trip generation data (Fehr & Peers 2002). The results of these calculations are summarized in Table 3.8-1. Project-related operational emissions would not exceed the MBUAPCD's thresholds for project operations in 2010 (project build-out year). Therefore, this impact is considered *less-than-significant*. No mitigation is required.

Table 3.8-1 on Page 3.8-5 is revised as follows:

1 **Table 3.8-1** Operational Emissions (lbs/day)

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
Residential (1)	6.7	2	9
Visitor Units (2)	0.1	0.8	0
Landscaping Equipment (3)	22	22	1
New Equestrian Center (4)	N/A	N/A	5
Vehicle Emissions (5)	32	28	22
Total	121	53	37
Thresholds	137	137	82

Sources: URBEMIS2002 model, CARB 2004.

Notes:

(1) Assumptions for residential use: Includes 33 single-family units and 60 employee housing units. Single-family units presumed to each have fireplace in operation on worst-case day. Employee housing units presumed not have fireplaces. URBEMIS used to derive estimate; includes natural gas, fireplace, minor landscaping, and personal product use.

(2) Assumptions for visitor units: Includes total of 160 units. URBEMIS used to derive estimate; includes natural gas and personal product use.

(3) Assumptions for landscaping: Includes assumption of 4 total landscaping equipment engines each 75 HP in operation for 8 hours per day presumed to cover needs at new golf course, Spanish Bay Driving Range, New Equestrian Center, and minor landscaping elsewhere. CARB engine emission factors used. ROGs and NOx totals are overstated as CARB factors only provide a single combined ROG/NOx rate; the single combined daily emission of ROG+NOx was included in both the ROG and NOx total shown above.

(4) Assumptions for New Equestrian Center: Landscape equipment included in Item 3. PM10 emissions from exercise rings estimated as ½ acre of construction disturbance at 10 lbs/acre/day (URBEMIS factor). Likely overstates actual PM10 emissions after application of water as proposed by applicant.

(5) Assumptions for vehicle emissions: 2,918 total project trips were projected; 1,955 trips were assumed external and 963 were assumed internal. External trips were calculated using the default values provided by the model for the North Central Coast Air Basin. Internal trips were assumed to have 4 miles per trip with an average speed of 30 mph.

2

Page 3.8-8 Line 37 to Page 3.8-9 Line 7 are revised as follows:

MBUPACD'S ~~does not have a~~ threshold of significance for diesel exhaust is a carcinogenic risk of one incident in 100,000 population Due to the amount of construction truck and equipment use proposed for the project ~~and the lack of a quantitative standard of significance~~, a short-term significant impact ~~is~~ may be possible. Thus, this is considered a potentially significant impact but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-C2.

Mitigation Measure AIR-C2. The applicant shall require all construction contractors to use catalytic particulate filters and low-sulfur diesel fuel for all diesel-powered construction equipment and trucks ~~that are retrofitted with diesel particulate filters~~ above 50 horsepower. To reduce TAC emissions, the applicant shall require all construction contractors working on this project to utilize ~~shall use an oxidation catalyst or~~ catalytic particulate filters ~~on all diesel-powered equipment above 50 horsepower~~, and ~~use~~ CARB-certified low-sulfur diesel fuel (less than or equal to 15 parts per million by weight (ppmw)) on all diesel-powered equipment above 50 horsepower. Use of these filters and low-sulfur fuel is expected to reduce diesel exhaust emissions by 90 percent, and reduce this impact to less than significant. MBUAPCD has identified that this mitigation would reduce risks to acceptable levels and that a formal risk assessment would not then be necessary (MBUAPCD 2004).Such mitigation shall be required unless a risk assessment submitted to and approved in writing by the MBUAPCD demonstrates that carcinogenic TAC risks from diesel exhaust are less than one incident in 100,000 population.

Chapter 3.9 – Noise

Page 3.9-4 Lines 17 to 18 are revised as follows:

- **Recreation Trails.** Relocation of existing trail segments and construction of new trail segments, for a net increase of 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of new trails.

Page 3.9-10 Line 36 through P. 3.9-11 Line 3 are revised as follows:

Table 3.9-6 presents a list of noise generation levels for various types of equipment typically used on construction projects. The list, compiled by the Federal Transit Administration (1995), and from several other sources (Cowen 1994, Hoover 1996) was used in this analysis to estimate construction noise. The magnitude of construction noise impacts was assumed to depend on the type of construction activity, the noise level generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the duration of the activity, the distance between the activity and noise-sensitive receivers, and any shielding effects that might result from local barriers, including topography.

Page 3.9-11, Table 3.9-6, has been modified to include a reference sound level for a chainsaw, a wood chipper, pile-driving equipment, and blasting use. See revised table below.

Page 3.9-11 Line 6 through 16 are revised as follows:

A worst-case assumption for construction equipment (other than blasting or pile-driving) is that the three loudest pieces of equipment would operate simultaneously and continuously over at least a 1-hour period for a combined source noise level. Based on the noise levels summarized in Table 3.9-6, Table 3.9-7a presents estimated sound levels from construction activities as a function of distance. Simultaneous operation of a paver, scraper, and truck for a combined source level of 93 dBA at 50 ft is assumed. Point-source attenuation of 6 dB per doubling of distance, as well as molecular absorption of 0.7 dB per 1,000 ft and anomalous excess attenuation of 1 dB per 1,000 ft, are assumed (Hoover 1996). Table 3.9-7a indicates that the construction significance criteria of 85 dBA would be exceeded at a distance of 125 ft or less from construction activities for construction equipment (other than pile-driving and blasting).

Potential construction noise at distance for potential impact pile-driving and blasting activity are similarly shown in Table 3.9-7b and 3.9-7c respectively which indicate that the significance criteria could be exceeded at a distance of 200 feet for pile-driving, and at a distance of 125 feet or less for blasting. Vibratory pile-driving would generate less noise that impact pile-driving by about 5 dB. The geotechnical reports for sites involving excavation (Fairway One, Lodge at Pebble Beach underground parking, and Inn at Spanish Bay underground parking) indicate that, based on soil borings to date, soldier piles probably won't be necessary, but their use cannot be ruled out. Subsurface

Revised Table 3.9-6. Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels

Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft from Source
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Blasting	94
Chain Saw	81
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Derrick	88
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Generator	81
Grader	85
Impact Pile-Driver	101
Jack Hammer	88
Loader	85
Paver	89
Pneumatic Tool	85
Pump	76
Roller/Sheep's Foot	74
Saw	76
Scraper	89
Shovel	82
Truck	88
Vibratory Pile-Driver	96
Woodchipper	89

Source: Federal Transit Administration 1995, Cowan 1994, Hoover 1996

Table 3.9-7a. Estimated Construction Noise in the Vicinity of an Active Construction Site

Distance Attenuation	
Distance to Receptor (ft)	Sound Level at Receptor (dBA)
50	93
100	87
125	**85**
400	74
600	70
800	68
1,000	65
1,500	61
2,000	58
2,500	55
3,000	52
4,000	48
5,280	44
7,500	37

The following assumptions were used:

Basic sound level drop-off rate:	6.0 dB per doubling of distance
Molecular absorption coefficient:	0.7 dB per 1,000 ft
Anomalous excess attenuation:	1.0 dB per 1,000 ft
Reference sound level:	93 dBA
Distance for reference sound level:	50 ft

Notes: This calculation does not include the effects, if any, of local shielding, which may reduce sound levels further.

Estimates are based on Jones & Stokes' calculations for a paver, scraper, and truck.

Table 3.9-7b. Estimated Construction Noise in the Vicinity of Impact Pile Driving

Entered Data:			
Construction Condition: Pile Driving			
Source 1: Impact pile driving - Sound level (dBA) at 50 feet =		101	
Average Height of Sources - Hs (ft) =		10	
Average Height of Receiver - Hr (ft.) =		5	
Ground Type (soft or hard) =		soft	
Calculated Data:			
Sound level (dBA) at 50 feet =		101	
Effective Height (Hs+Hr)/2 =		7.5	
Ground factor (G) =		0.62	
Distance Between Source and Receiver (ft.)	Geometric Attenuation (dB)	Ground Effect Attenuation (dB)	Calculated Sound Level (dBA)
50	0	0	101
100	-6	-2	93
200	-12	-4	85
300	-16	-5	81
400	-18	-6	77
500	-20	-6	75
600	-22	-7	73
700	-23	-7	71
800	-24	-7	69
900	-25	-8	68
1000	-26	-8	67
1200	-28	-9	65
1400	-29	-9	63
1600	-30	-9	62
1800	-31	-10	60
2000	-32	-10	59
2500	-34	-10	57
3000	-36	-11	54

Calculations based on FTA 1995.

This calculation does not include the effects, if any, of local shielding which may reduce sound levels further.

Table 3.9-7c. Estimated Construction Noise in the Vicinity of Blasting

Entered Data:	
Construction Condition: Pile Driving	
Source 1: Blasting - Sound level (dBA) at 50 feet =	94
Average Height of Sources - Hs (ft) =	1
Average Height of Receier - Hr (ft.) =	5
Ground Type (soft or hard) =	Soft
Calculated Data:	
Sound level (dBA) at 50 feet =	94
Effective Height (Hs+Hr)/2 =	3
Ground factor (G) =	0.66

Distance Between Source and Receiver (ft.)	Geometric Attenuation (dB)	Ground Effect Attenuation (dB)	Calculated Sound Level (dBA)
50	0	0	94
100	-6	-2	86
200	-12	-4	78
300	-16	-5	73
400	-18	-6	70
500	-20	-7	67
600	-22	-7	65
700	-23	-8	64
800	-24	-8	62
900	-25	-8	61
1000	-26	-9	59
1200	-28	-9	57
1400	-29	-10	56
1600	-30	-10	54
1800	-31	-10	53
2000	-32	-11	51
2500	-34	-11	49
3000	-36	-12	47

Calculations based on FTA 1995.

This calculation does not include the effects, if any, of local shielding which may reduce sound levels further.

conditions cannot be determined with absolute certainty until the excavation phase of a project under construction and thus pile-driving could be used for this project. Like the use of soldier piles, the use of explosives to a certain extent is a possibility given conditions that may be encountered during construction. Explosives are used for construction in a variety of settings. For example, explosives were used previously on a limited basis at Casa Palmero to construct underground parking, at Spanish Bay at the club house basement and at the Spanish Bay Phase 2 residences.

Page 3.9-12 Line 4 through 11 are revised as follows:

Table 3.9-8 summarizes anticipated construction-related noise levels (from construction equipment other than pile-drivers and blasting) near project revision areas where distances to noise-sensitive receptors are known. Where distances to noise-sensitive receptors are unknown (areas marked with a "NA" designation), any noise-sensitive land uses that may be located within 125 ft of active construction activities would be exposed to noise levels above the significance criteria of 85 dBA and would experience a significant noise impact. As noted above, noise-sensitive land uses within 125 feet of blasting activity and within 200 feet of pile-driving (if these activities are actually conducted) could also be exposed to noise levels above the significance criteria. Consequently, this impact is considered a *significant*, but would be reduced to *less-than-significant* with implementation of the following mitigation measures.

Page 3.9-15, the following measures are added after Line 35:

Mitigation Measure NOISE-B1-9: Implement Best Management Practices to reduce airblast and vibration from blasting, if conducted during construction. The project applicant shall retain a qualified blasting specialist to develop a site-specific blasting program report to assess, control, and monitor airblast and ground vibration from blasting. The report shall be reviewed and approved by Monterey County prior to issuance of a blasting permit. The report shall include, at minimum, the following measures:

- The contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep blast-related vibration at offsite residential and other occupied structures as low as possible, consistent with blasting safety. In no instance shall blast vibration, measured on the ground adjacent to a residential or other occupied structure, be allowed to exceed the frequency-dependent limits specified in the Alternative Blasting Level Criteria contained in United States Bureau of Mines (USBM) Report of Investigations 8507.

- The project contractor shall use current state-of-the-art technology to keep airblast at offsite residential and other occupied structures as low as possible. In no instance shall airblast, measured at a residence or other occupied structure, be allowed to exceed the 0.013-psi (133-dB) limit recommended in USBM Report of Investigations 8485.

- The project contractor shall monitor and record airblast and vibration for blasts within 1,000 feet of residences and other occupied structures to verify that measured levels are within the recommended limits at those locations. The contractor shall use blasting seismographs containing three channels that record in three mutually perpendicular axes and which have a fourth channel for recording airblast. The frequency response of the instrumentation shall be from 2 to 250 Hz, with a minimum sampling rate of 1,000 samples per second per channel. The recorded data must be such that the frequency of the vibrations can be determined readily. If blasting is found to exceed specified levels, blasting shall cease, and alternative blasting or excavation methods that result in the specified levels not being exceeded shall be employed.

- Airblast and vibration monitoring shall take place at the nearest offsite residential or other occupied structure. If vibration levels are expected to be lower than those required to trigger the seismograph at that location, or if permission cannot be obtained to record at that location, recording shall be accomplished at some closer site in line with the structure. Specific locations and distances where airblast and vibration are measured shall be documented in detail along with measured airblast and vibration amplitudes.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-B1-10: Implement Best Management Practices to reduce noise and vibration from pile-driving, if conducted during construction. The project applicant shall employ the following measures for reducing noise and vibration from pile driving during all pile driving activities such that vibration is not perceptible at occupied structures and noise does not exceed applicable local noise standards:

- Locate pile driving equipment as far as possible from noise and vibration-sensitive land uses.

- Avoid simultaneous operation of pile drivers .

- Avoid nighttime pile driving in residential areas.

- Employ local barriers, enclosures, or shrouds to reduce noise from pile driving.

- Employ alternative pile placement methods that result in less noise and vibration than traditional impact pile-driving methods. These methods may include:
  - use of vibratory pile drivers,
  - use of pre-drilled holes,
  - use of cast-in-place piles,
  - use of non-displacement piles (i.e. H piles),

- use of pile cushioning (placing resilient material between hammer and pile), and/or
- use of non-impact drivers that use torque and down-pressure or static loading to press piles into place.

Chapter 3.10 – Cultural Resources

Page 3.10-2 Lines 19, the following is added:

Excavation will also be required for the Phase 1B Improvement at the Highway 1/68/17-Mile Drive interchange.

Page 3.10-9 Lines 22 to 31 are revised as follows:

All of the proposed development sites have been investigated for presence of archaeological resources, including the Phase 1B improvement locations for the Highway 1/68/17-Mile Drive interchange. The records searches found that there are numerous archaeological sites recorded on the coast in Del Monte Forest, but no recorded sites are found on the proposed development sites (Archaeological Consulting, 1989, 1993, 1996, 2002, LSA 2001). While there are several previously recorded archaeological resources within the Spanish Bay vicinity, there are no archaeological resources considered significant for the purposes of CEQA within the area of this project component. The previously recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity are not within the actual development area and would not be affected by the Proposed Project.

Based on previous records searches and field investigations, there is no evidence of archaeological resources considered significant for the purposes of CEQA, or known burial sites within any of the project development sites (Archaeological Consulting, 1989, 2001, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, LSA 2001).

Chapter 3.11 – Energy Services

A new energy section is added following Chapter 3.10 and before Chapter 4.0-1 as follows.

Chapter 3.11
Energy Services

Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of existing energy uses in the Proposed Project area. Potential impacts of the Proposed Project related to energy consumption are

also evaluated in this chapter. The environmental setting below is the basis for evaluating the impacts of the Proposed Project at the end of this chapter. This section was drafted prior to the issuance of the Final EIR based on comments received during the Draft EIR's circulation period. Although an energy section did not appear in the Draft EIR of this document, all impact findings are less than significant and subsequently do not require additional mitigation. Therefore, based on the absence of significant impacts, a recirculation of the Draft EIR is not warranted.

Impacts

Criteria for Determining Significance

Energy significance criteria and thresholds are only generally defined in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix F. For this project, energy impacts would be considered significant if the project would:

- use energy in an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary manner; or
- require or result in the construction of new energy facilities or substantial expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant secondary environmental effects.

Impacts

A. Temporary increase in energy use

Impact ENERGY-A1. A temporary increase in the use of non-renewable energy would occur during project construction. Such use is not considered an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use. Construction fuel demand can be met by existing sources and facilities and this impact is considered less than significant.

Project construction would result in short-term energy expenditures. Energy, mainly in the form of vehicle fuels would be utilized by construction equipment, which is needed to deliver construction materials, remove construction and demolition debris and for the transportation of workers to and from the project area. Mobile construction equipment is necessary to implement the project and its use is not considered particularly inefficient or wasteful. The short-term energy demand for fuels by construction equipment can be met through existing sources and facilities. This is a *less than significant* impact.

B. Long term increase in energy use

Impact ENERGY-B1. A permanent increase in the use of electricity and natural gas would occur during project operation for residences, visitor-serving facilities, and recreational facilities. The increased energy use is considered necessary and is not considered particularly wasteful or

inefficient. Project energy demand can be met by existing sources and facilities. This is a less than significant impact.

Energy resources in particular, electricity and natural gas, will be used to supply energy to the housing and visitor-serving components of the proposed project, as well as to buildings included in the recreational elements. Energy consumption within private residences, commercial buildings, and other facilities is highly dependant on numerous variables including weather and temperature patterns, the internal loads of buildings that consume energy (e.g. lighting, heating, cooking, refrigeration, and other appliances), as well as heating, cooling and ventilation.

In 2000, the average annual per capita electricity use within California was 7,178 kWh (California Energy Commission 2004e). This is the second lowest rate within the U.S. The estimated population increase within the Del Monte Forest due to project implementation is 292 permanent residents, which would equate to an increase in electricity usage of 2.1 million kWh annually based on the average per capita use. As part of the proposed project, 160 new visitor-serving units would be constructed. Assuming a 70% annual occupancy rate and 1.4 persons per unit, and using the California per capita use, the visitor-serving units could result in an increase of 1.1 million kWh annually. Together, residential and visitor-serving uses (using these calculations) would equate to roughly a 0.01 percent increase in electricity usage in Monterey County. Additional energy will also be used at the buildings at the Proposed Golf Course, Spanish Bay Driving Range, and the New Equestrian Center.

Natural gas would also be consumed in residential, visitor-serving, and recreational buildings for heating and other uses, although the portion of natural gas consumed by the project relative to Monterey County usage or to California usage is on the similar magnitude as that noted above for electricity.

Residential and non-residential buildings will have to meet current California energy efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations).

The Del Monte Forest is substantially developed such that new connections for electricity and natural gas lines can be effected without the need for substantial new line; such connections can also be accommodated during the development of project infrastructure and road improvements. Thus expansion of energy lines is expected to be limited and not result in significant secondary environmental effects. The overall increase energy demand is expected to met by existing energy courses and facilities. Development of new energy sources and this is considered a *less than significant* impact.

Impact ENERGY-B2. A permanent increase in the use of energy for transportation and equipment operation would also occur as a result of the proposed project, but is not considered unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful, and project demand can be met by existing sources and facilities. This impact is less than significant.

Transportation and equipment use resulting from operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of vehicle fuels. This increase is due to increased trip generation in the form of vehicle transportation and the activity of maintenance equipment such as lawnmowers.

Estimated project trip generation is shown in the Chapter 3.7 (Transportation and Circulation) Table 3.7-7. Daily internal and external trips generated by the proposed project are estimated at 963 and 1,955, respectively. The applicant submitted a Facilities Trip Reduction Plan (FTRP) as part of the application for this project. The FTRP included the following measures for commercial/tourist-oriented activities: bicycle amenities; pedestrian facilities; other site amenities; park & ride; transportation system management program; education and marketing; preferential parking for carpools; on-site services; park & ride shuttles, marketing for special events and tourist-oriented vehicle use reduction (PBC 2001). Implementation of the Phase 1B as part of the project, by reducing delay at the Highway 68/1/17 Mile Drive interchange will reduce vehicle fuel consumption due to congestion. The construction of 60 employee-housing units within the Del Monte Forest will help to reduce the number of miles traveled per trip by converting external employment trips, which are assumed to be 20 or more miles, to internal trips, less than five miles, which is an efficient aspect of the project. The location of visitor-serving accommodations in direct proximity to new and relocated recreational serving uses (e.g. the Proposed Golf Course, the New Equestrian Center, and the Spanish Bay Driving Range) reduces visitor-serving traffic trip distance between recreational activity and overnight stay locations.

Mitigation measures are identified in the Chapter 3.7 to reduce traffic level of service impacts to less than significant levels to avoid project-related congestion increases that would otherwise increase fuel consumption. Mitigation identified in Chapter 3.7 also includes the development of an alternative transportation plan (Mitigation Measure TC-F1), which is expected to result in continuation and expansion of existing shuttle services and may result in increased transit options in the Del Monte Forest.

Additional fuels would be consumed by maintenance equipment, particularly at the Proposed Golf Course and the Spanish Bay Driving Range. Golf carts used by visitors will be electric.

The use of vehicle fuels for transportation and maintenance equipment during project operation is considered necessary, and with the mitigation proposed for traffic noted above, would not be considered wasteful or inefficient.

Transportation/maintenance equipment demand for fuels can be met by existing sources and facilities. The increase in energy consumption during operation for transportation is thus considered a *less than significant impact.*

Setting

Energy Sources

Currently, approximately 42 percent of the petroleum and 78 percent of the electricity used in California are produced within the state (California Energy Commission 2004d). Below is a description of the potential sources of energy, which may be used in the Proposed Project.

Petroleum Fuels

California obtains about one-half of its crude oil supply from sources within the state. Widely used petroleum fuels consist primarily of gasoline and diesel fuel for vehicles, fuel oils for industrial uses and the generation of electrical power, and various liquid fuels, such as kerosene and propane, which are used in a variety of ways.

Natural Gas

While California's annual usage of natural gas in the residential, commercial, industrial, and electricity generation sectors has fluctuated between 1.75 and 2.4 trillion cubic feet between 1990 and 2002, California's annual usage of natural gas in the residential sector has remained nearly level since 1990. Usage of natural gas in the residential sector has accounted for 0.48 to 0.52 trillion cubic feet annually during the same period (California Energy Commission 2004f).

The production of natural gas in California meets approximately 16% of the state's demand (California Energy Commission 2004a).

Electricity

Diverse sources of electricity are employed within California. In 2003 approximately 26 percent of the state's electricity production was produced by renewable sources (California Energy Commission 2004d). Electricity use within Monterey County is shown below in Table 3.11-1.

Table 3.11-1. Energy Deliveries for Monterey County in 2000

Residential		Nonresidential		Total	
Number of Accounts	kWh (million)	Number of Accounts	kWh (million)	Number of Accounts	kWh (million)
119,594	755	19,217	1,827	138,811	2,582

Source: California Energy Commission 2004b.

Chapter 4.01 – Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

No revisions were made.

Chapter 4.02 – Significant, Irreversible Environmental Changes

Page 4.2-1 Line 29 to Page 4.2-2 Line 7 are revised as follows:

Development associated with the Proposed Project would result in the continuing increase in automobile and transit trips which would result in consumption of fossil fuels. ~~The additional trips, plus construction activities from development, could subject the region to future increases in ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen and sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter emissions. These issues are discussed in detail in the Chapter 3.7 "Transportation and Circulation," and Chapter 3.8 "Air Quality." Other significant environmental issues associated with the Proposed Project are addressed in Chapters 3.1 through 3.11 and summarized in the Executive Summary. Cumulative impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.4.~~

Chapter 4.03 – Growth Inducing Impacts

Page 4.3-1 Lines 19 to 20 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would add a total of 160 visitor serving units at Spanish Bay Resort, The Lodge at Pebble Beach, and the Golf Cottages.

Page 4.3-1 Lines 26 to 27 are revised as follows:

These elements of the project would result in a total of 33 new residences and 60 ~~62~~ employee housing units.

Page 4.3-2 Lines 3 to 7 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would have a direct economic growth-inducing effect through the creation of approximately 144 ~~150~~ new jobs within the Del Monte Forest related to the Proposed Golf Course, Spanish Bay Driving Range, and the increase in the number of visitor serving units at the Proposed Golf Course, Spanish Bay Resort, and The Lodge at Pebble Beach.

Chapter 4.04 – Cumulative Impacts

Page 4.4-6 line 18–21 are revised as follows:

As described in Appendix D, the County has determined that the project, as mitigated in this document would be consistent ~~consistency~~ with LUP Policy 113 regarding resource constraints. Measure A would remove the resource constraints overlay for all proposed project sites.

Page 4.4-6 Line 32 – 33 are revised as follows:

Other development in the Del Monte Forest will need to comply with the requirements of the LUP, the CIP, and applicable zoning regulations

Page 4.4-13, Lines 21 through 22 are revised as follows:

The present extent of Monterey pine forest with undeveloped understory is less than 13,500 ~~13,600~~ acres (Jones & Stokes 1996b, Jones & Stokes 2004).

Page 4.4-13, the following is added to Line 35:

Partial update of the earlier mapping identified removal of approximately 79 acres of undeveloped Monterey pine forest in Monterey County due to development (a loss of about 1%) between 1993 and 2002 (Jones & Stokes 2004).

Page 4.4-14, Lines 11 and 12 are revised as follows:

- Identifying the undeveloped forested areas within Monterey County (from Jones & Stokes 1996b and Jones & Stokes 2004).

Page 4.4-14, Lines 32 through 34 are revised as follows:

Based on these assumptions, cumulative development (including the project) could result in a loss of 1,613 ~~1,564~~ acres or about 17% of the extant undeveloped forest in Monterey County (see Table 4.4-4).

Tables 4.4-4 and 4.4-5, following pages 4.4-14 and 4.4-15, respectively have been updated to provide the correct forest acreage as shown below.

Page 4.4-17, Lines 10 –25 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-2(C). Dedication of additional areas of undeveloped Monterey pine forest. The applicant shall dedicate additional areas (minimum of 362 ~~244~~ acres) of undeveloped pine forest to offset the contribution of the Proposed Project to a substantial cumulative loss of Monterey pine forest. This amount was calculated from the cumulative mitigation ratio as shown in Table 4.4-5. The areas of undeveloped pine forest owned by the applicant to be dedicated shall include: most of ~~parcels in~~ Area F-1

Revised Table 4.4-4. Summary of Cumulative Impact Analysis for Monterey Pine Forest

Element	Acres	Notes
Project Contribution (taking into account mitigation for direct effects)		
Project Removal	99	Direct removal of forest
Project Conversion	8	Residential area within reduced (0.5 acre) Bldg. Envelope
Foregone Restoration at Sawmill Site	23	Area of foregone restoration
Restoration at Proposed Golf Course	-7.5	Restoration valued at 50% of forest acre (see text discussion)
Enhancement of parts of Area J/Old Capitol Site	N/A	Not quantified; if feasible and performed in areas lacking native understory, enhancement would be valued at 25% of forest acre loss (see text discussion)
Project Contribution to Cumulative Impact	123	Net loss of forest, including foregone restoration (represents >1 % loss in Monterey Region)
Cumulative Impact		
Undeveloped Monterey Pine Forest in Monterey Region in 2002	9,289 ~~9,407~~	See table in Appendix E
"Unprotected" Areas of Forest in Monterey Region	5,644 ~~5,762~~	All areas not identified as protected (excludes project area, see table in Appendix E)
Area of forest expected to be retained	4,233 ~~4,322~~	Based on review of environmental impact reports and project conditions, 75% of forest is "normally" being retained as condition of development
Forest areas presumed lost due to cumulative development	1,411 ~~1,441~~	Unprotected areas not retained (excludes project area)
Cumulative impact including project contribution	1,534 ~~1,564~~	Represents 17% loss in Monterey Region
Additionally-Required Mitigation for Cumulative Contribution		
Retention		
Proposed Project Retention	553	Includes proposed preservation, conservation, and other areas
Required retention (75% of extant in project area)	510	75% of 680 acres of extant forest within project area
Additional Preservation for Project Contribution		
Mitigation Ratio	2.95 ~~2.33~~	See Table 4.4-5
Preservation Required per ratio	362 ~~287~~	Mitigation Ratio * 123 acres (project contribution)
~~Additional Preservation Required~~	~~244~~	~~Preservation required (287 acres) minus the proposed dedication amount that exceeds the retention requirement noted above (43 acres)~~
Additionally Required Preservation Areas ~~Undeveloped Monterey Pine Forest with Other Areas owned by Applicant~~		
Area F-1	9 ~~10~~	Within Del Monte Forest, entire area except one lot (up to 1 acre) to be dedicated
Area J	8 ~~9~~	Within Del Monte Forest, entire area except one lot (up to 0.5 acre)to be dedicated
Old Capitol Site	75	East of Highway 1 (site is larger, acres is undeveloped forest), entire area to be dedicated
Aguajito	270 ~~795~~	East of Highway 1, area of dedication within 795-acre forest ~~(site is larger, amount is undeveloped forest)~~

Revised Table 4.4-5 Monterey Pine Forest Cumulative Mitigation Framework, Calculation of Preservation Ratio

Area	Acres	Methodology/Sources
Undeveloped Monterey Pine Forest in County	9,289 ~~9,407~~	The area of undeveloped Monterey pine forest in Monterey County was identified using GIS analysis from a prior study conducted for CDFG (Jones & Stokes 1994a) partially updated using 2002 aerial imagery (Jones & Stokes 2002)
Target amount of undeveloped MPF to be retained (F)	8,900 ~~8,937~~	With interim cap of losses at 5% of the 1993 extant forest, 95% of undeveloped Monterey pine forest would remain.
Undeveloped Monterey Pine Forest in County that is "Protected" (P)	2,965	Areas supporting undeveloped Monterey pine forest that are currently protected by either being in public ownership (such as Pt. Lobos State Reserve or Jack's Peak County Park), conservation ownership (such as by the Big Sur Trust or the Del Monte Forest Foundation) or are protected by the prior dedication of conservation easements (such as Huckleberry Hill Natural Area, which was previously dedicated by the applicant) were identified in 2003 (see table in Appendix E)
Area not developed with retainage ratio of 75% (R)	4,233 ~~4,322~~	Based on prior environmental impact reports and permit conditions, a presumption was made that "normal" County permitting practice was requiring retention of approximately 75% of undeveloped forest. Using this presumption, 75% of the area that is not "protected" (5,644 ~~5,762~~ acres, excludes project area) would be retained.
Project preservation areas (PP)	458	Includes both preservation and conservation areas (See Table 3.3-1)
Project retainage in non-dedicated areas (PR)	94	See Table in Appendix E
Total areas protected or retained (Pt)	7,751 ~~7,840~~	Total of P + R + PP + PR
Additional Preservation Needed (P*)	1,149 ~~1,097~~	Remaining area needed to be preserved to meet 95% target and avoid 5% interim cap loss.
"Allowable" interim loss of undeveloped MPF (A1)	468 ~~470~~	Five percent of extant undeveloped Monterey pine forest in Monterey region in 1993.
Loss of undeveloped MPF, 1993 – 2002 (L)	79	From partial update of 1993 mapping
"Allowable" future interim loss (A2)	389	Net of loss of forest in last decade
Compensation Ratio to cap loss at 5% (R = P*/A2)	2.95 ~~2.33~~	The quotient of additional area preserved (P*) over the allowable remaining development loss (A2) results in the ratio of 2.95 ~~2.33~~:1 (acres of additional preservation to be provided for each acre of allowable development loss, in areas other than the 75% *in situ* retention area).

(except an area of no larger than 1-acre with a 0.5-acre building envelope to accommodate development of a single-family residence on the existing residential lot), the areas required for dedication for project impacts to Yadon's piperia in Area K, ~~and~~ most of the existing parcels in Area J (except a ½-acre area in the southeast end of northeast existing parcel) ~~in the Del Monte Forest ; and~~ the entire Old Capitol site; and a portion of the Aguajito site east of Highway 1. Given that the location of the project impact on pine forest is within the Del Monte Forest, The portions of Areas F-1 and J not allowed for development and the Old Capitol Site shall be dedicated in their entirety, with the balance (270 acres) from a portion of the Aguajito site. The dedicated area at the Aguajito site shall be determined by Monterey County and shall: a) include the Yadon's piperia found in 2005 surveys, b) be contiguous to the maximum extent feasible, c) be designed to minimize the edge to interior ratio of the forest; and d) consist of preserve areas of a minimum size of 20 acres. Resource management of these areas shall be conducted in accordance with Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-1 ~~in Chapter 3.3, Biological Resources~~ as revised in this FEIR. The dedications shall be in accordance with the requirements of Mitigation Measure BIO-B1-6 as revised in this FEIR ~~in Chapter 3.3~~.

Page 4.4-26 Lines 30 to 31 are revised as follows:

The Proposed Project would also dedicate conservation easements for approximately 458 ~~454~~ acres of Monterey Pine Forest.

Page 4.4-43 Lines 12 to 15 are revised as follows:

Impact PSU-K1 (C). Under cumulative plus project conditions, the Proposed Project may contribute to demand for landfill capacity. The Marina ~~Marin~~ landfill has adequate capacity for the project and for reasonably foreseeable cumulative development. No cumulative impact is identified.

Page 4.4-51, Lines 24 to 34 are revised as follows:

Highway 68/Aguajito Road. Under cumulative plus project conditions, the Proposed Project would exacerbate existing failed operations (i.e., LOS F) for the critical left turn ~~side-street~~ movement from Aguajito Road at the Highway 68/Aguajito Road intersection during the evening peak hour. Although no project traffic is anticipated to be added directly to the critical side-street movement, project traffic will further minimize the size and availability of gaps in mainline Highway 68 traffic that would be sufficient for traffic movements onto Highway 68. Based on the significance criteria, this is considered a *significant* cumulative impact, the project contribution of the project to this cumulative impact can be reduced to *less than significant* with Mitigation Measure TC-B1-3(C) described below ~~in Chapter 3.7, "Transportation and Circulation".~~

Mitigation Measure TC-B1-3(C). The applicant shall make a fair-share contribution toward the installation of a median acceleration lane at the

intersection of Highway 68/Aguajito Road. The installation of a median acceleration lane would allow refuge for vehicles turning left out of Aguajito Road from traffic on eastbound Highway 68 and the northbound Highway 1 on-ramp. Signalization is not recommended at this location, due to both the relatively low traffic volumes on the Aguajito Road approach and the close proximity of the northbound Highway 1 on- and off-ramps. The County will establish a separate program to allow for collection of fair-share fees. A preliminary rough estimate of the cost of this acceleration lane ($200,000) was made by Higgins & Associates (actual cost may vary). Based on this preliminary rough estimate and the project's contribution to traffic at this intersection (average of 2.4% of morning and evening peak hour total baseline plus project volumes) the applicant's fair-share would be approximately $5,179.

Chapter 5 - Alternatives

Table 5.0-1, following page 5.0-4 is revised as shown in the revised table.

Page 5.0-8 Lines 15 to 27 are revised as follows:

This alternative contains the following components:

- 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course
- 60 employee housing units at PBC Corp Yard.
- Smaller Spanish Bay Driving Range at Area C
- Clustered residential development in Area F-2
- A total of 65 visitor-serving units at the Lodge and Inn
- Rest of development as in Proposed Project

The characteristics of each of these components are discussed below. Some of the components included in this analysis could stand alone as alternatives to components of the Proposed Project. For example, a technically feasible alternative would be to include a 9-hole expansion of the Spyglass Hill Golf Course with the rest of the development included in the Proposed Project. This analysis includes the analysis of individual components, but has been combined to provide analysis of a suite of components on a conceptual level.

Page 5.0-12 Lines 6 to 30 are revised as follows:

Reduced visitor-serving units at Lodge and Inn. The proposed developments at the Inn at Spanish Bay and the Lodge at Pebble Beach would be similar to the Proposed Project, but reduced to a total of 65 units to reflect the likely reduction in generated demand from a 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill compared to the Proposed Project generated demand from a new 18-hole course.

Alternative	Primary Features	Summary of Alternatives Analysis
Proposed Project	Golf course in Area MNOUV Equestrian Center at Sawmill site Expansion at Inn and Lodge (160 units) Spanish Bay Driving Range Employee Housing (60 units) Residential lots (33 lots) Internal Road and Trail Improvements Highway 1/68 Improvements 436 acres of preservation 56 acres of conservation adjacent to development 54 acres of resource management within development Resource management	Applicant's proposed project Presented in Chapter 2.0 **Analyzed in Chapters 3.1–3.11 and 4.1 - 4.4**
1. No Project	No new golf course No relocation of equestrian center No Inn/Lodge expansion No new driving range No new employee housing No road, trail improvements No new preservation or resource management Existing management of open space Single-family residential lots on certain existing legal lots	**Analyzed in DEIR as required by CEQA.** Would result in no new recreational, visitor-serving development, no new subdivisions, no new preservation, no new resource management, and no improvements to Highway 1/68/17-Mile Drive interchange. Single-family residential development on existing lots (1 dwelling unit per existing legal lot is allowed under the certified LCP on residentially-designated areas) would have limited environmental impacts. There are an estimated 41 legal lots within the project area; thus it is theoretically possible than 41 single-family residences might ultimately be built in absence of the project. Permit review process likely to require conditions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Alternative	Primary Features	Summary of Alternatives Analysis
2. Project Redesign	9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course Preservation of larger portion of Area MNOUV 60 employee housing units at PBC Corp Yard. Smaller Spanish Bay Driving Range at Area C Clustered residential development <u>Reduced (65) visitor-serving units at the Lodge and Inn</u> Rest of development as in proposed project	**Considered potentially feasible and analyzed in DEIR** Would meet all project objectives, most goals, but not applicant's goal of 18-hole course and goal for new teaching facility. Would substantially lessen impacts on biological resources in Area MNOUV, avoid biological resource impacts on Area B, F-3, and K, and reduce impact at Area C. Impacts on biological resources on Area F-2 higher than proposed project. Would lower traffic levels, traffic related emissions and demand for water/reclaimed water relative to proposed project. Potential slope constraints at Corporation Yard for expanded employee housing. Would lower average lot size in Area F-2 and require additional access road improvement for fire access. Other impacts similar to proposed project.
3. Reduced Land Use Intensity	9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course Preservation of larger portion of Area MNOUV Smaller Equestrian Center at Sawmill site Consolidated parking at Spanish Bay Reduced residential development (20 lots) Reduced visitor-serving units (65 ~~76~~ units) Rest of development/preservation as in proposed project	**<u>Considered potentially feasible and analyzed in DEIR</u>** Would meet most project objectives, some goals, but not applicant's goal of 18-hole course and goals for numbers of residential lots and visitor accommodations. Would substantially lessen impacts on biological resources in Area MNOUV and would also lessen impacts at the Sawmill site, Area C, F-2, F-3, I-2, PQR Would eliminate ability to hold large equestrian events in DMF. Would lower traffic levels, traffic-related emissions, and demand for public services relative to proposed project. Potential geotechnical challenges in increasing the amount of underground parking at Spanish Bay. Other impacts similar to proposed project.

Alternative	Primary Features	Summary of Alternatives Analysis
4. Alternative Uses	No new golf course Use part of Area M and N for other recreation, residential use, or other visitor-serving use Preservation of larger portion of Area MNOUV No relocation of the equestrian center Spanish Bay Driving Range at Sawmill site 60 employee housing units at PBC Corp Yard. Clustered residential development in Area F-2 Rest of development/preservation as in proposed project	**Considered potentially feasible and analyzed in DEIR** Would meet most project objectives, but not applicant's goal of 18-hole course and not several other project goals Economic viability of alternative uses at Area M and N undetermined. Would require amendment of LCP. Residential use and visitor-serving use option at Area M and N would not be consistent with Measure A. Would substantially lessen impacts on biological resources in Area MNOUV, B, C, F-3, and K. Residential use option at Area M and N would have higher demand for public services than proposed project. Other visitor serving uses option at Area M and N (inn/conference center, concert hall/arena) would result in increased traffic, emissions, and noise. Potential slope constraints/impacts at Corporation Yard for expanded employee housing Other impacts similar to proposed project.
Alternatives Considered but Dismissed From Further Analysis in this EIR		
A. Refined Alternative 2 from 1997 FEIR	Golf Course similar to Proposed Project 364 Residential Lots No Inn/Lodge expansion 254 acres of preservation in open space forest 31 acres of conservation adjacent to development 114 acres of resource management within development	Analyzed in 1995 RDEIR and 1997 FEIR. *Dismissed from further analysis in Draft EIR as this alternative would result in greater impacts to sensitive biological resources than proposed project and insufficiently meets current project objectives.*
B. Original PBC Lot Program	Golf Course in Area PQR 403 Residential Lots No Inn/Lodge expansion 25 acres of preservation in open space forest 52 acres of conservation adjacent to development 204 acres of resource management within development.	Analyzed in 1995 RDEIR and 1997 FEIR *Dismissed from further analysis in this Draft EIR due to prior finding that alternative would result in greater impacts to sensitive biological resources than proposed project and insufficiently meets of current project objectives.*

Alternative	Primary Features	Summary of Alternatives Analysis
C. Revised Layout for 18-hole Championship Golf Course at Area MNOUV	Golf Course in Area MNOUV Realigned to lower effects on biological resources Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed for feasibility in DEIR. *Dismissed from further analysis of impacts in the Draft EIR as infeasible due to limited space outside of sensitive biological resource areas.*
D. Non-Championship 18-hole Golf Course at Area MNOUV	Golf Course in Area MNOUV Reduced length, width, and changed alignment of holes to reduce impact on biological resources Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed for feasibility in DEIR. *Dismissed from further analysis of impacts in the Draft EIR due to doubtful economic feasibility and probable of elimination of the existing driving range and/or Peter Hay executive course*
E. Nine-hole executive golf course expansion of Peter Hay at MNOUV	Nine-hole executive golf course in Area MNOUV as expansion of Peter Hay. Relocation of Equestrian Center Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed for feasibility in DEIR. *Dismissed from further analysis of impacts in Draft EIR due to doubtful economic feasibility.*
F. New Golf Course on Huckleberry Hill (Alternative 3 from 1995 RDEIR)	Golf course on Huckleberry Hill Golf suites on Huckleberry Hill No relocation of Equestrian Center No new development on Area MNOUV Preservation of undeveloped parts of Area MNOUV Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed for feasibility in DEIR *Dismissed from further analysis in DEIR as infeasible due to conflict with LCP ESHA policies and impacts to Huckleberry Hill natural resources.*
G. New Golf Course at Area PQR	Golf Course in Area PQR No relocation of Equestrian Center Preservation of undeveloped parts of Area MNOUV Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed in 1995 DEIR. *Dismissed from further analysis in DEIR because previous DEIR determined a golf course in Area PQR to have greater impacts on sensitive biological resources than proposed project golf course.*
H. New Golf Course at Sites Outside the DMF	New Golf Course at Old Capitol, Aguajito, Odello Property, or Fort Ord Preservation of undeveloped parts of Area MNOUV No relocation of Equestrian Center Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed in 1995 RDEIR and in DEIR for feasibility. *Dismissed from further analysis of impacts in DEIR because of feasibility concerns, lack of nexus with rest of project, and likely impact to similar sensitive resources.*

Alternative	Primary Features	Summary of Alternatives Analysis
I. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)	Provision of development rights at alternative location in exchange for no development of Area MNOUV. No relocation of Equestrian Center Rest of development as in proposed project	Analyzed in 1997 FEIR and in this DEIR for feasibility. *Dismissed from further analysis in DEIR because there is no TDR program applicable to the DMF, the location of alternative sites and impacts at these sites is speculative, and locations outside of DMF have no economic nexus to rest of project.*

Rest of development/preservation. The rest of development would be as described for the Proposed Project, including relocation of the Equestrian Center to the Sawmill site, ~~the proposed developments at the Inn at Spanish Bay, the Lodge at Pebble Beach~~, residential subdivision in Area I-2 and PQR, internal road and trail improvements, the Highway 1/68 interchange improvements, preservation/conservation, and resource management.

Feasibility. The 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course is technically and physically feasible, in that it can be built on the site at Area MNOUV and its operations can be integrated into the operation of a 27-hole championship golf facility. Economically, expansion by nine holes could increase the rounds of golf at Spyglass Hill Golf Course substantially. The nine-hole expansion is nominally estimated to be able to accommodate between 18,700 (the applicant's estimate) and 24,000 (the DEIR's estimate) rounds of golf annually. This is a substantial number of new golf rounds.

The applicant prepared a financial analysis for a stand-alone 9-hole golf course in Area MNOUV (not connected to Spyglass Hill Golf Course) that indicated that such a course would be financially infeasible due to the cost of construction and the lowered amount of revenue, which would provide a return on investment after 43 years and a negative net present value at 30 years (PBC 2004c). However, a stand-alone 9-hole golf course was not the element included within this Alternative, which is a 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course to make it a 27-hole course.

The EIR consultant reviewed the financial data provided by the applicant as it may apply to a 9-hole expansion of the Spyglass Hill Golf Course. This preliminary review, and the example of the successful operation of 27-hole courses elsewhere in the country, indicates that a nine-hole expansion would appear to be feasible.

Therefore, given the data available at this time, the 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill Golf Course (to a 27-hole course) alternative is considered *potentially* economically feasible.

No specific design has been developed for consolidated 60 units of employee housing at the Corporation Yard; thus the technical feasibility of this component is undetermined. A smaller driving range is technically feasible and would provide a range directly adjacent to the Spanish Bay course, where there presently is none. Clustering of residential lots is feasible.

Page 5.0-18 Lines 25 to 27 are revised as follows:

Reduced visitor-serving units at Lodge at Pebble Beach and Inn at Spanish Bay. This component would include less than half (65 units) of the units of the Proposed Project ~~(31 units~~ at The Lodge at Pebble Beach and ~~45 units at~~ the Spanish Bay Resort~~)~~ to reflect the reduction in generated demand from a 9-hole expansion of Spyglass Hill compared to the Proposed Project generated demand from a new 18-hole course.

Chapter 6 – Report Preparation

The following list of agencies, organizations, and persons consulted in the preparation of the DEIR is added to the end of Chapter 6.

List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Consulted

Federal Agencies

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

State Agencies

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 5
California Coastal Commission (CCC)
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
California Department of Food and Agriculture
State Water Resources Control Board, Water Rights Division (SWRCB)

Local Agencies

Carmel Unified School District
Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD)
Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
City of Monterey
City of Pacific Grove
Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD)
Monterey County Department of Public Works
Monterey County Sheriff
Monterey County Parks Department
Monterey County Environmental Health Division
Monterey County Public Library
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District
MPWMD - Monterey Peninsula Water Management Agency
Monterey Regional Waste Management District
Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST)
Pacific Grove Unified School District
Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD)
Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC)

Organizations

California-America Water Company
California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee (DMF LUAC)
Del Monte Forest Property Owners (DMFPO)
Monterey Pine Forest Watch (MPFW)
Pebble Beach Equestrian Center
Sierra Club, Ventana Chapter

Individuals

Graff, Alison, Ph.D., Biologist
Win U., Ph.D., CSU Monterey Bay
Yadon, Vern, Consulting Botanist

Applicant and Applicant's Consultants

Balance Hydrologics
Carmel Development Corporation
Denise Duffy & Associates
Fehr & Peers
Lombardo & Gilles
Pebble Beach Company (PBC)
Questa Engineering
Wetland Research Associates (WRA)
WWD Corporation
Zander & Associates

Chapter 7 – References

The following references are added to the list of references:

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2004. CARB Emission Standards for landscape equipment unit use.

Fehr & Peers. 2004b. Intersection Analysis Data for Highway 68 and Aguajito Intersection. December.

LSA Associates, Inc. 2001. Air Quality Analysis Highway 68/Highway 1/17 Mile Drive Intersection Improvement Project. Prepared for Carmel Development Company. December 19.

LSA Associates, Inc. 2001. Archeological Study Highway 68/Highway 1/17 Mile Drive Intersection Improvement Project. Prepared for Carmel Development Company. December 19.

Mark Thomas & Associates. 2001. Conceptual Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for Route 68/1 Ramp and Pebble Beach Entrance Improvement Project. Prepared for Pebble Beach Company. December 2.

Appendix A – Initial Study

No revisions made.

Appendix B – Traffic

No revisions made.

Appendix C – Regulatory Setting

DEIR Appendix C, Regulatory Setting, page C-1 of the DEIR is clarified as follows:

Coastal Act

Land use along California's coast is regulated under the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Public Resources Code Section 30,000 et seq.). The Act established the CCC and set out policies for the planning and protection of the coast. The CCC is responsible for protecting coastal resources and regulating land uses within the Coastal Zone either directly, through the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) process, or in an oversight capacity where local governments, such as Monterey County, have had a LCP certified by the Commission. Specific references to the Del Monte Forest within the Coastal Act and the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan are limited to delineation of the coastal zone boundary.

Appendix D – Land Use Plan Policy Consistency

Page D-11 Policy last sentence in first paragraph under Consistency Determination is revised as follows:

In addition, there are approximately 29 miles of existing trails that will be realigned and 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of new trails proposed, some of which are proposed within, or near, designated ESHA.

Page D-23 Policy 23 is revised as follows:

Consistency Determination: The referenced expansion of S.F.B. Morse Botanical Reserve boundary has already been implemented by the dedication of Huckleberry Hill and the project will not conflict with this dedication. The

project proposes additional dedication of approximately 134 acres ~~133 acres~~ of preservation area (Areas D, F-3, G, H, and the Corporation Yard) that are located contiguous with the existing Huckleberry Hill Natural Area and S.F.B. Morse Botanical Reserve.

Page D-24 Policy 25 is revised as follows:

Consistency Determination: There are currently approximately 29 miles of pedestrian and equestrian trails in the Del Monte Forest. The proposed project will relocate some of these trails and will also add approximately 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of new trails.

Page D-37 Policy 36, 2nd full paragraph, last sentence is revised as follows:

The Spanish Bay employee housing site is concentrated on approximately 4 acres of the site which allows the remaining 20 acres ~~16 acres~~ to be preserved as open space.

Page D-60 Policy 71, 2nd paragraph under Consistency Determination is revised as follows:

[2] Commercial visitor-serving facilities proposed in the proposed project include an 18-hole golf course with eleven adjacent visitor suites, driving range, 149 ~~154~~ additional visitor units at the Inn at Spanish Bay and the Lodge at Pebble Beach as well as meeting space at both locations.

Page D-61 Policy 72 is revised as follows:

Consistency Determination: The proposed project does not include coastal dependent uses. However, the development components of the project primarily include new commercial recreational uses – a new golf course, relocated Equestrian Center, and new driving range at Spanish Bay - and 160 new visitor-serving units. The remaining uses consist of 33 residential lots and 60 ~~62~~ employee housing units

Page D-70 Policy 89, 2nd to last sentence under Consistency Determination is revised as follows:

The project will add 2.4 ~~3.6~~ miles of new public trails for a total of approximately 31.4 ~~32.5~~ trail miles.

Page D-78 Policy 105 is revised as follows:

Consistency Determination: Visitor-serving facilities in the proposed project include an 18-hole golf course with eleven adjacent visitor suites, relocated Equestrian Center, driving range, 149 additional visitor serving units ~~154 additional visitor units~~ at the Inn at Spanish Bay and the Lodge at Pebble Beach as well as meeting space at both locations.

Page D-89 Policy 124 is revised as follows:

Consistency Determination: New development has been sited and designed to avoid encroachment onto designated trail routes, except at the new golf course site and residential subdivision F-2, F-3 and I-2. At these locations existing trail segments have been realigned. The proposed project proposes approximately 2.4 miles ~~3.6 miles~~ of new trails and the relocation of some existing trails. Relocation of existing trails is necessary to accommodate the new golf course and the residential development at Area F-2, F-3, and I-2. Although some trails will be substantially realigned, the proposed trails will connect with the existing trail to maintain trail system continuity.

Appendix E – Biological Resources

Page E-4, Lines 6-20 are revised as follows:

The Monterey Peninsula supports the largest Monterey pine forest of the extant natural occurrences (Figure E-2). It is estimated that Monterey pine forest historically covered approximately 18,000 acres on the Monterey Peninsula and vicinity, of which approximately ~~9,400~~ 9,300 acres of Monterey pine forest with natural understory (i.e., undeveloped forest) are estimated to remain in 2002 (Jones & Stokes 2004 ~~1994a~~). Estimates of the historical extent and remaining undeveloped forest vary depending on inventory methodology. Another study conducted in the mid-1990s (Huffman 1994) estimated that the historical extent of the Monterey pine forest in the Monterey area covered 11,000–12,000 acres and that the remaining undeveloped natural stands cover about 6,400 acres (Huffman and Associates 1994). The extent of remaining native stands of Monterey pine forest at Año Nuevo (1,500 acres), Cambria (2,300 acres), Cedros Island (370 acres), and Guadalupe Island (220 trees in 2001) are far smaller than those on the Monterey Peninsula (Jones & Stokes 1996b; Rogers 2002). Jones & Stokes mapped the extent of undeveloped forest in 1994 based on 1993 aerial imagery and partially updated that mapping in 2004 using 2002 aerial imagery. A comparison of the two mapping efforts identified removal of approximately 79 acres of forest due to development or a loss of 1%. The actual change in undeveloped forest could be higher than this estimate, as use of aerial imagery does not allow for a precise assessment of potential loss of understory within forested areas. For this report, the estimate of undeveloped Monterey pine forest used as baseline to measure project impacts is ~~9,400~~ 9,300 acres (Jones & Stokes 2004 ~~1994a~~).

Page E-9 Lines 19 to 20 are revised as follows:

A total of 10.46 ~~10.3~~ acres of wetlands occur within the project area: 5.9 ~~5.7~~ acres within development site boundaries and 4.6 acres within proposed preservation/conservation areas (see Table E-4 and Table E-5a in this appendix; Table E-5b lists riparian areas).

Table E-4 following Page E-9 is revised as shown in the revised table.

Revised Table E-4. Summary of Wetlands and Riparian Areas Within Project Areas

Project Area	Freshwater Marsh	Seasonal Wetland	Total Wetland Area	Riparian Linear Feet (LF)
Proposed Golf Course Area (MNOUV)	0.12	4.31	4.43	0
New Equestrian Center (Sawmill)	0.19 ~~1.14~~	1.20 ~~0.25~~	1.39	0
Spanish Bay Employee Housing Preservation Area B	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,147
Spanish Bay Driving Range Conservation Area C	0.81 ~~0.80~~	0.00	0.80	0
Preservation Area H	0.00	1.30	1.30	0
Preservation Area I-1	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,309
Preservation Area J	0.20 ~~0.00~~	0.00 ~~0.20~~	0.20	86
Conservation Area K	0.35 ~~0.00~~	0.00 ~~0.35~~	0.35	400
Preservation Area L	0.01	0.04	0.05	215
Preservation Area PQR	0.00	1.73 ~~1.70~~	1.73 ~~1.70~~	400
Corporation Yard Preservation Area	0.00	0.17	0.17	0
Total in Project Development and Preservation Areas	**1.68** **~~2.63~~**	**8.78** **~~7.83~~**	**10.46**	**4,557**
Subtotal in Project Development Areas	*0.31* *~~1.26~~*	*5.54* *~~4.59~~*	*5.85*	*0*
Subtotal in New Preservation Areas	*1.37*	*3.24*	*4.61* *~~4.59~~*	*4,557*
Existing Preserved Area Huckleberry Hill Natural Area	NA	NA	10.01	0

Sources: EcoSynthesis 2000; EcoSynthesis 2003; WRA 2001; EIP 1997; EIP 1995; WWD, 2002, various correspondence.

Table E-5a following Table E-4 is revised as shown in the revised table.

Page E-10 Lines 24 to 27 are revised as follows:

The project development areas contain a total of 0.3 acres of freshwater marsh on the Proposed Golf Course and New Equestrian Center at the Sawmill site (EcoSynthesis 2003). Freshwater marshes are also located in several of the proposed preservation and conservation areas, containing 1.37 acres.

Page E-10 Lines 40 to 41 are revised as follows:

The project development areas contain 5.5 acres of seasonal wetlands (County of Monterey 1997; WRA 2001; EcoSynthesis 2000 and 2003).

Page E-11, Line 35 through Page E-12 Lines 6 are revised as follows:

"Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas are defined under the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code, Section 30107.5) as:

Areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem, and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. ~~In addition, some of these sensitive habitats require further protection from disturbance, and this subset of sensitive habitats is called environmentally sensitive habitat areas.~~"

Table E-8 following Page E-16 is revised as shown in the revised table.

Table E-9 prior to Page E-17 is revised as shown in the revised table.

Page E-21 Lines 12 to 13 are revised as follows:

Hickman's potentilla is a small perennial herb in the rose family. It dies back in the summer ~~winter~~ to a woody taproot.

Page E-39, Lines 7 through 11 are revised as follows:

A natural freshwater marsh is located in the southwestern corner of the site and is immediately behind residences and along a residential road. This wetland meets the definition of an ESHA (Ecosynthesis 2000). This wetland provides suitable habitat for CRLF, although ~~no~~ none have been observed in surveys to date (WRA 2002a, 2002b, 2003). This wetland is located immediately adjacent to residences to the south and Majella Road to the west. Table E-15 provides a summary of the sensitive biological resources located on this site.

Page E-40, Lines 6-9 are revised as follows:

Wetland	Area	Watershed	Description	100' Buffer Infringement	Area (acres)	Notes
Wetlands Within Development Areas						
A1	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 11 (tee box); paved cart path	0.03	Proposed Golf Course
A2	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 11 (tee box); Hole 9 (tee box)	0.04	Proposed Golf Course
B1	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 11 (green, fairway, sandtrap)	0.12	Proposed Golf Course
B2	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 11 (green, fairway, sandtrap)	0.02	Proposed Golf Course
C	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 11 (sandtrap); Hole 12 (fairway, tee box)	0.11	Proposed Golf Course
D	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 12 (fairway, tee box); paved cart path; bridge	0.20	Proposed Golf Course
F1	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 3 (fairway)	0.81	Proposed Golf Course
F2	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.05	Proposed Golf Course
F3	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 3 (tee box)	0.01	Proposed Golf Course
G	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 3 (tee box, fairway); 9 (green, fairway); paved cart path; bridge	0.94	Proposed Golf Course
H	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	10 (tee boxes, fairway)	0.70	Proposed Golf Course
I	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	10 (tee boxes, fairway); 13 (tee box); paved cart path and bridge over I drainage	0.16	Proposed Golf Course
J	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 13 (green, fairway); Hole 18 (green); paved cart path	0.04	Proposed Golf Course
K	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 13 (green, fairway); Hole 18 (fairway); paved cart path	0.12	Proposed Golf Course
L1	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Paved cart path	0.03	Proposed Golf Course
L2	**MNOUV**	**Fan Shell**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**Hole 18 (fairway); paved cart path**	**0.12**	**Proposed Golf Course**
M	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 14 (tee box); paved cart path	0.75	Proposed Golf Course

Wetland	Area	Watershed	Description	100' Buffer Infringement	Area (acres)	Notes
N	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 14 fairway	0.17	Proposed Golf Course
O	MNOUV	Fan Shell	Seasonal Wetland	Hole 1 (tee box); paved cart path	0.01	Proposed Golf Course
B-B	B	Moss Beach	Seasonal Wetland	New Trail	0.03	Employee Housing Area
S-A1	**Sawmill**	**Sawmill Gulch**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**Turnaround area within 100'; temporary event use within 100'**	**0.19**	**Within New EQ Center**
S-A2	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Turnaround area within 100'; temporary event use within 100'	0.95	Within New EQ Center
S-B	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Yes	0.03	Within New EQ Center
S-C	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Yes	0.05	Within New EQ Center
S-D	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Yes	0.06	Within New EQ Center
S-E	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Yes	0.01	Within New EQ Center
S-F	Sawmill	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Yes	0.10	Within New EQ Center

Wetland	Area	Watershed	Description	100' Buffer Infringement	Area (acres)	Notes
Wetlands Within New Preservation/Conservation Areas						
C-A	**C**	**Moss Beach**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**No**	**0.04**	**Within New Conservation Area**
C-B	**C**	**Moss Beach**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**No**	**0.77**	**Within New Conservation Area**
1	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	1.21	Within New Preservation Area
2	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.06	Within New Preservation Area
3	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.04	Within New Preservation Area
4a	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.25	Within New Preservation Area
4b	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.10	Within New Preservation Area
4c	PQR	Carmel Bay ASBS	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.07	Within New Preservation Area
3	Corp Yard	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	New Trail; no direct; buffer area previously disturbed	0.17	Within New Preservation Area
H-A	H	Seal Rock Creek	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.07	Within New Preservation Area
H-B	H	Seal Rock Creek	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.04	Within New Preservation Area
H-C	H	Seal Rock Creek	Seasonal Wetland	No	1.19	Within New Preservation Area
J-1	**J**	**Seal Rock Creek**	**Freshwater marsh**	**No**	**0.20**	**Within New Preservation Area**
K-A	**K**	**Seal Rock Creek**	**Freshwater marsh**	**No**	**0.35**	**Within New Conservation Area**
L-A	L	Seal Rock Creek	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.04	Within New Preservation Area
L-B	**L**	**Seal Rock Creek**	**Freshwater marsh**	**No**	**0.01**	**Within New Preservation Area**

Wetland	Area	Watershed	Description	100' Buffer Infringement	Area (acres)	Notes
Wetlands Within Existing Preserved Area in HHNA						
1	**HHNA**	**Sawmill Gulch**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**No**	**0.07**	**Existing Preserved Area**
2	**HHNA**	**Sawmill Gulch**	**Freshwater Marsh**	**No**	**0.47**	**Existing Preserved Area**
4	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.40	Existing Preserved Area
5	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.03	Existing Preserved Area
6	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.01	Existing Preserved Area
7	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.04	Existing Preserved Area
8	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.01	Existing Preserved Area
9	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.84	Existing Preserved Area
10	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	Possibly less than 100' to edge of new EQ Center road	0.30	Existing Preserved Area
11	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.02	Existing Preserved Area
12	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.04	Existing Preserved Area
13	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Freshwater Marsh	No	2.61	Existing Preserved Area
14	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.12	Existing Preserved Area
15	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	4.04	Existing Preserved Area
16	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.17	Existing Preserved Area
17	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.01	Existing Preserved Area
18	HHNA	Sawmill Gulch	Seasonal Wetland	No	0.83	Existing Preserved Area

Wetland	Area	Watershed	Description	100' Buffer Infringement	Area (acres)	Notes
Subtotals By Type and Development						
Freshwater Marsh in Development Areas					0.31	
Freshwater Marsh in New Preservation/Conservation Areas					1.37	
Seasonal Wetland in Development Areas					5.54	
Seasonal Wetland in New Preservation/Conservation Areas					3.24	
Total in Project Development and Preservation Areas					10.46	
Subtotals By Area						
MNOUV					4.43	
Sawmill					1.39	
B					0.03	
C					0.81	
H					1.30	
HHNA					10.01	
Corporation Yard					0.17	
J					0.20	
K					0.35	
L					0.05	
PQR					1.73	
Subtotals By Development/Preservation						
Total in Development Areas					5.85	
Total in New Preservation/Conservation Areas					4.61	
Total in Existing Preserved Areas					10.01	
Sources: Ecosynthesis 2000; Ecosynthesis 2003; WRA 2001; EIP 1997; EIP 1995; various correspondence						
Notes: Wetlands in bold are considered "Freshwater Marsh" and to meet DMF LUP definition of ESHA. Wetland S-A in the Sawmill Gulch is partially categorized as an ESHA freshwater marsh ("S-A1" – 0.19 acre) and partially as a non-ESHA seasonal wetland ("S-A2" – 0.95 acre. ESHA identification in HHNA based on WRA, 2001 description; all semi-permanently saturated wetlands presumed to be freshwater marsh ESHA determination for Wetland L-2 (Proposed Golf Course), Wetlands C-A, and C-B (Spanish Bay Driving Range); and Wetland S-A based on Ecosynthesis 2003 ESHA identification for Wetland J-1, K-A, L-B, based on EIP 1995 and EIP 1997.						

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Allium hickmanii Hickman's onion	--/--/1B	Closed-cone conifer forest, chaparral, and grasslands	Monterey Peninsula and near Jolon, Monterey County 23 occurrences in California; 17 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	April-May	New Golf Course (MNOUV) and Areas F-3, G, H, I-1, and PQR
Arctostaphylos edmunsii var. *edmundsii* Little Sur manzanita	--/--/1B	Coastal bluff scrub and chaparral	Monterey County	Year round	None
Arctostaphylos edmundsii var. *parvifolia* Hanging gardens manzanita	--/R/1B	Chaparral	Monterey County	Year round	None
Arctostaphylos hookeri ssp. *hookeri* Hooker's manzanita	--/--/1B	Chaparral, closed-cone coniferous forest, and coastal scrub	Near the coast in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties 10 occurrences in California; 6 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Feb-May	New Golf Course (MNOUV); F-2, F-3, G, H, I-1, I-2, PQR; Congress Road improvement; HHNA, and SFB Morse Preserve
Arctostaphylos montereyensis Toro manzanita	--/--/1B	Chaparral, oak woodland, and coastal scrub	Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties	Year round	None
Arctostaphylos pajaroensis Pajaro manzanita	--/--/1B	Sandy hills in chaparral	Monterey County	Year round	None
Arctostaphylos pumila (*A. uva-ursi* var. *pumila*) * Sandmat manzanita	--/--/1B	Closed-cone conifer forest, coastal scrub, and coastal dunes	About Monterey Bay 15 occurrences in California; all of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Year round	Areas F-2, F-3, H, I-1, PQR, and SFB Morse Preserve.
Astragalus tener var. *titi* Coastal dunes milk vetch	E/E/1B	Coastal dunes	Monterey Bay and San Diego Bay	Mar-May	None
Castilleja latifolia * Monterey Indian paintbrush	--/--/4	Coastal dunes and scrub	Central Coast	April-May	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune), Area L, Indian Village

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Ceanothus cuneatus var. *rigidus* * Monterey ceanothus	--/--/4	Widespread in maritime chaparral; closed-cone conifer forest on sandy hills and flats	Monterey Peninsula	Feb-Mar	(SFB Morse Preserve)
Chorizanthe rectispina Straight-awned spineflower	--/--/1B	Chaparral, oak woodland, and grassland	Coast Ranges of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties	Jun-Jul	None
Chorizanthe robusta var. *robusta* Robust spineflower	E/--/1B	Coastal dunes and scrub on dry, sandy places below 1,000 feet	Coastal Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties	May-Sept	None
Chorizanthe pungens var. *pungens* Monterey spineflower	T/--/1B	Maritime chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, sandy soils	Monterey Peninsula and coastal north Monterey County 27 occurrences in California; 19 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Apr-Jun	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune), Area L, Indian Village
Collinsia multicolor San Francisco collinsia	--/--/1B	Dry, stony and grassy slopes in coastal scrub and closed-cone coniferous forest	San Francisco County to San Mateo County	Mar-May	None
Cordylanthus rigidus spp. *littoralis* Seaside bird's-beak	--/E/1B	Coastal scrub, closed-cone conifer frst, oak woodland, and chaparral on dry, sandy soils below 3,000 feet	Coast Ranges of Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties	May-Sep	None
Cupressus goveniana spp. govenianam * Gowen Cypress	T/--/1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest, maritime chaparral	Monterey County 3 occurrences in California; all of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)		Areas F-2, F-3; I-1, L (probably planted?), and native occurrences in HHNHA, SFB Morse Botanical Reserve
Cupressus macrocarpa * Monterey cypress	--/--/1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest	Monterey County 2 occurrences in California; both occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Year round	New Golf Course (MNOUV), Lodge at Pebble Beach, Inn at Spanish Bay, Area F-3, I-1, L, (all planted)

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Delphinium hutchinsoniae Hutchinson's larkspur	--/--/1B	Coastal scrub, coastal prairie, and mixed ever-green forest	Monterey County	Mar-Jun	None
Delphinium umbraculorum Umbrella larkspur	--/--/1B	Cismontane woodland; usually shaded places	Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties	April-Jun	None
Ericameria fasciculata Eastwood's goldenbush	--/--/1B	Closed-cone conifer forest, chaparral, and coastal scrub	Monterey and Carmel Bays	Jul-Oct	SFB Morse Preserve
Eriogonum butterworthianum Butterworth's buckwheat	--/R/1B	Chaparral	Monterey County	Jun-Jul	None
Eriogonum nortonii Pinnacles buckwheat	--/--/1B	sandy soils in chaparral, valley and foothill grassland, often on recent burns	Monterey and San Benito Counties	May-Jun	None
Erysimum ammophilum Coast wallflower	--/--/1B	Coastal dunes	Coastal areas of Montery and Santa Cruz County, and Santa Rosa Island; known from only 10 occurrence, nearly extirpated on the Monterey Peninsula (CNPS 2001)	Feb-Jun	None
Erysimum menziesii ssp. Menziesii Menzies' wallflower	E/E/1B	Coastal dunes	Monterey County and from Fort Braff to north of Humboldt Bay 10 occurrences in California; 7 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Mar-Jun	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune), Indian Village
Erysimum menziesii spp. yadonii Yadon's wallflower	E/E/1B	Coastal dunes	Monterey County	Jun-Aug	None
Fritillaria liliacea Fragrant fritillary	--/--/1B	Coastal scrub and grassland; often on ultra-mafic soils	Sonoma County to Monterey County	Feb-Apr	None

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Gilia tenuiflora ssp. *Arenaria* Sand gilia	E/T/1B	Coastal dunes and scrub	Monterey Bay region 30 occurrences in California; 29 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Apr-Jun	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune)
Horkelia cuneata ssp. *Sericea* Kellogg's horkelia	--/--/1B	Sandy and gravelly places in coastal scrub and closed-cone coniferous forest	Along the coast from Sonoma County to Santa Barbara County	Apr-Sept	None
Layia carnosa Beach layia	E/E/1B	Widely scattered stations on coastal sand dunes	Humboldt County to San Francisco County and historically to Point Concepcion 27 occurrences in California; 4 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Apr-Jul	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune)
Layia jonesii Jones's layia	--/--/1B	Chaparral and grassland	Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties	Mar-May	None
Lupinus tidestromii var. *tidestromii* * Tidestrom's lupine	E/E/1B	Coastal dunes	Monterey Peninsula 20 occurrences in California; 11 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	May-Jun	New Golf Course (Signal Hill Dune)
Malacothamnus palmeri var. involucratus Carmel Valley Bush Mellow	--/--/1B				None
Malacothrix saxatilis var. *arachnoidea* Carmel Valley cliff-aster	--/--/1B	Rocky open banks of chaparral and mixed ever-green forest	Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties	Jun-Dec	None
Plagiobothrys uncinatus Hooked popcornflower	--/--/1B	Chaparral and possibly grassland and cismontane woodland	Monterey and San Benito Counties	Apr-May	None
Potentilla hickmanii * Hickman's potentilla (also known as Hickman's cinquefoil)	E/E/1B	Scrub, closed-cond coniferous forest and vernally mesic sites	Known from only two occurrences on the Monterey Peninsula	Apr-Aug	Indian Village

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Pinus radiata Monterey Pine	--/--/1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland	Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, and San Mateo Counties, Baja California, 5 occurrences in California; 2 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)		Occurs on or adjacent to all project sites
Piperia yadonii Yadon's piperia (aka Yadon's rein orchid)	E/--/1B	Coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, maritime chaparral, on sandy soils	Monterey County. 20 occurrences in California; all of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	May-Aug	New Golf Course (Area MNOUV) and Areas B, F-1, F-2, F-3, G, H, I-1, I-2, J , K, L, and PQR. HHNA and SFB Morse Preserve. Potential habitat in the Congress Road improvement area.
Rosa pinetorum Pine rose	--/--/1B	Pine woodlands and canyons	Central coast, San Francisco Bay and Southern Coast Range. 6 occurrences in California; 5 of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County	May-Jul	New Golf Course (Area MNOUV), F-2, F-3, G, H, I-1, I-2, L, and in Drainage adjacent to Sawmill site (HHNA)
Sidalcea hickmanii spp. *hickmanii* Hickman's checkerbloom	--/--/1B	Hillsides in chaparral	Monterey County	Jun-Jul	None
Sidalcea malachroides Maple-leafed checkerbloom	--/--/1B	Coastal scrub, perennial grassland, Redwood forest, Douglas-fir forest, in open, often disturbed areas, 5-2,300'	North coast and northern central coast from Humboldt County to Monterey County, Oregon	Feb-Mar	None
Stebbinsoseris decipiens Santa Cruz microseris	--/--/IB	Open areas in broad-leaved upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, and coastal scrub, sometimes serpentinite	Monterey, Marin and Santa Cruz Counties	Apr-May	None
Trifolium buckwestiorum Santa Cruz clover	--/--/1B	Moist grassy areas on margins of broad-leaved upland forest, cismontane woodland, and coastal prairie, sometimes in disturbed areas, 200-1,800'	San Francisco Bay area and central coastal California, Endemic to Santa Cruz County, also known from Monterey and Sonoma Counties	May-Oct	None

Species [A]	Status[B] Fed/State/CNPS	Habitats	Distribution in California and Monterey County [C]	Identification Period	Occurrence in Project Sites
Trifolium polydon * Pacific Grove clover	--/R/1B	Closed-cone coniferous forst, coastal prairie, meadow	Known only from three occurrences on the Monterey Peninsula 12 occurrences in California; all of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Apr-Jun	New Golf Course (in existing EQ center); Indian Village
Trifolium trichocalyx * Monterey clover	E/E/1B	Closed-cone coniferous forest, openings, burned areas	Monterey County 2 occurrences in California; both of these occurrences are reported from Monterey County (CNDDB 2002)	Jun-Nov	Area G

Notes:

[A] Species (significant occurrences only) identified with an * are listed as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas in Appendix A of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan.

Additional "watch list" plants (CNPS List 4) have been documented in the Del Monte Forest but are not evaluated in this EIR because they do not fit the definition of special-status species and more importantly, they occur largely within open space areas. This CNPS List 4 species include small-leaved lomatium (*Lomatium parvifolium*), adder's tongue fern (*Ophioglossum californicum*), and Gairdner's yampah (*Perideridia gairdnerii*).

[B] Status Definitions

– = no listing.

Federal

E = listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.

T = listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act.

SC = species of concern; species for which existing information indicates it may warrant listing but for which substantial biological information to support a proposed rule is lacking.

State

E = listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

R = listed as rare under the Cal. Native Plant Protection Act. This category is no longer used for newly listed plants, but some plants previously listed as rare retain this designation.

– = no listing.

California Native Plant Society

(Note: CNPS is a private environmental group. Presence on a CNPS list is not indicative of any formal local, state, or federal status or protection. However, List 1B species are commonly determined to meet the CEQA definition of a "rare" species and do so for the plants noted above related to the Proposed Project.)

1B = List 1B species: considered to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.

4 = List 4 species: considered to be plants of limited distribution – a watch list.

[C] Distribution information was obtained from the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS's) (2001) 6th Edition Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. The total number of recorded occurrences in California and in Monterey is provided for special-status plants documented in the project area and was obtained from the California Department of Fish and Games NDDB (2002)

Revised Table E-9. Special Status Plant Location Summary by Project Area

[NOTE: For Yadon's Piperia see PRDEIR Table P2-1)

Site	~~Yadon's piperia~~		Hooker's manzanita	Hickman's Onion	Other Special Status Plants
	~~acres~~	~~individuals~~	acres	acres	occurrences
Proposed Golf Course Area (MNOUV)	~~41.8~~	~~14,730~~	1.9	0.02	Pacific grove clover, pine rose, and dune plants (Monterey spineflower, Menzies' wallflower, beach layia, sand gilia, Tidestroms' lupine, and Monterey Indian paintbrush)
New Equestrian Center	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		Pine rose
Inn at Spanish Bay	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Lodge at Pebble Beach	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Spanish Bay Employee Housing and Preservation Area B	~~0.6~~	~~425~~	0.0		
Spanish Bay Driving Range and Conservation Area C	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0		
Preservation Area D	~~1.0~~	~~177~~	N/A ~~18.4~~		Site not surveyed to date as no development proposed.
Residential Area F-2	~~0.4~~	~~99~~	18.4 ~~16.8~~		Gowen cypress, pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Residential Area F-3	~~11.8~~	~~1,579~~	16.8 ~~33.5~~	0.01	Gowen cypress, pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area G	~~9.1~~	~~966~~	33.5 ~~22.5~~	0.01	Monterey clover, pine rose
Preservation Area H	~~13.9~~	~~1,940~~	22.5 ~~9.8~~	0.01	Pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area I-1	~~0.1~~	~~32~~	9.8 ~~15.6~~	0.07	Pine rose, sandmat manzanita
Residential Area I-2	~~0.2~~	~~102~~	15.6 ~~0.0~~		Pine rose
Preservation Area J	~~1.5~~	~~1,526~~	0.0		
Residential Area K	~~0.2~~	~~199~~	0.0		
Conservation Area K	~~0.5~~	~~321~~	0.0		
Preservation Area L	~~2.3~~	~~255~~	0.0 ~~3.8~~		Pine rose, Monterey spineflower Monterey Indian paintbrush
Residential Area PQR	~~45.9~~	~~15,643~~	3.8 ~~25.3~~	0.00	Sandmat manzanita
Preservation Area PQR	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	25.3 ~~0.0~~	5.52	Sandmat manzanita (15 occurrences, including significant (ESHA) occurrence.
Internal Road Improvements	~~Potential~~	~~Potential~~	0.4	0.00	
Highway 1/68	~~0.0~~	~~0~~	0.0	0.00	
TOTAL	**~~129.3~~**	**~~37,944~~**	**148.0**	**5.64**	
HHNA/SFB Morse Preserve	~~Not Est.~~	~~7, 578~~	22.8		Gowen cypress and multiple other species
Sources: Allen 1996, EIP 1997, Yadon 2001, WWD 2002, Pebble Beach Company Biological Resource maps 2002, PBC 2003b, 2003d, Zander 2003a and 2003b, 2002b. Area I-1 revised per PBCSD plans for 2.2-acre expansion.					

Hooker's ~~Monterey~~ manzanita, huckleberry, and shaggy-bark manzanita are co-dominants in the shrub understory throughout the site, with toyon and coffeeberry also occurring in the northern quarter.

Page E-41, Lines 12-14 are revised as follows:

The understory of the northern third of this site is dense huckleberry, salal, and shaggy-bark manzanita. In the understory of the southern two-thirds of the site, Hooker's ~~Monterey~~ manzanita replaces shaggy-bark manzanita.

Page E-45 Lines 13 to 14 are revised as follows:

There are also forested areas to the west between Congress Road and Poppy Hills Golf Course. Improvements would occur along a 4,930-foot stretch of Congress Road.

Page E-47, Lines 5-7 are revised as follows:

Huckleberry, shaggy-bark manzanita, Hooker's ~~Monterey~~ manzanita, coyote brush, and poison oak are all common in the understory (County of Monterey 1997).

Page E-50 Lines 3 through 5 are revised as follows:

The stream channels, ~~and~~ riparian habitat, and wetland on this site are considered ESHAs~~; the wetland is not considered an ESHA~~ (County of Monterey 1997).

Appendix F – Internal Roadway Improvement Plans

No revisions made.

Appendix G – Potable and Reclaimed Water Demand Calculations

No revisions made.

Appendix H – Summary of Applicant's Resource Management Plans and Framework for Implementation

No revisions made.

Appendix I – Draft Transplantation Design, Enhancement, and Adaptive Management Plan (TEAM) for Yadon's Piperia

No revisions made.

Revisions to the Partial Revision of the Draft EIR

Introduction

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Executive Summary

Revisions to Table ES-1 (P) are included in the revised Table ES-2 for the overall project above.

Chapter P1 – Water Supply and Demand

Page P1-19, Line 21 to Page P1-21 Line 30 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure PSU-D3. Should the applicant transfer more than 100 AF of its entitlement to DMF residential uses (Phase II investors), the applicant shall ~~either fund the provision of 30AF of tertiary treated water to Carmel Lagoon or reduce consumption of potable water by an additional 41 AF to~~ offset increased withdrawals from the Carmel River between June and October of wet years by one of the following options: a) fund the provision of tertiary treated water to Carmel Lagoon; b) reduce consumption of potable water; and/or c) extend recycled water lines to replace potable water use by existing development. Water supply provided by these measures shall be scaled to the net increase in summer withdrawal from the Carmel River resultant from Project plus Phase II investor use.

With implementation of Measures PSU-D1 and PSU-D2, the mitigated project would decrease Carmel River withdrawals under average, dry, and very dry conditions. However, these measures will not offset a net increase in withdrawals between June and October of a wet year. As discussed below under the description of impacts to Carmel River biological resources, such dry season withdrawals during a wet year are still considered a significant impact. ~~This mitigation measure would require the applicant to either fund the assessment, CEQA evaluation, permitting, and provision of sufficient tertiary treated water to offset the project related increases in Carmel River withdrawals between June and October of a wet year or to provide for the water conservation of an additional up to 41 AF to offset the impact under these conditions.~~

If the applicant transfers 100 AF or less to Phase II investors, then the project plus Phase II investor demand would not result in a net increase of potable water use in the dry season of a wet year [see Appendix G, Table G.2-5F2]. Thus, this mitigation only applies if more than 100 AF of the applicant's entitlement is sold.

For the purposes of this measure, a "wet year" shall be defined based on a water year in which annual rainfall exceeds the 50-year average by more than 25%. This mitigation measure must be implemented between June and October, and decisions about when mitigation is warranted must be made by the end of May. Thus, the trigger for this mitigation will be when water year rainfall between October and May is more than 25% of the 50-year average for these months. The 50-year annual average for the Monterey Peninsula for these months is about 19 inches and thus this mitigation would be required in any water year in which rainfall for these months exceeds 24 inches by May 31.

a) Tertiary Treated Water Option. The potential use of tertiary treated water to supplement water levels in the Carmel River Lagoon has been discussed by the CAWD, the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, the California Coastal Conservancy, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, CDFG, USFWS, and other interested agencies and parties. However there is no current approved plan or permits to use treated water for the benefit of Carmel Lagoon resources.

The Carmel River Lagoon Enhancement and Management Plan Conceptual Design Report (PWA 1999) noted that the use of treated wastewater could enable a wide range of habitat types to be created or restored and could increase the probability of success of the restoration project that is now (2004) underway. Treated water could be released into the river or lagoon to increase water depths and reduce the effects of salinity stratification, primarily for the benefit of steelhead. Treated water could also be released to support riparian vegetation in and along the lagoon.

During wetter years, the CAWD with the Phase II Improvements will have excess capacity and storage beyond the demand of Del Monte Forest recycled water users including the Proposed Project. As noted in Appendix G, during the wet year scenario evaluated, there would still be more than 350 AF in Forest Lake Reservoir at the end of August. Thus, there would be ample availability to provide tertiary treated water ~~up to 30 AF~~ to Carmel Lagoon without any effect on Del Monte Forest irrigation. The tertiary treated water could be diverted from Forest Lake Reservoir or provided directly from CAWD.

The lead agency for this potential use of tertiary treated water would likely be CAWD. The responsible agencies with probably permitting authority include SWRCB, Central Coast RWQCB, Monterey County Environmental Health, State Department of Parks and Recreation, CDFG, the USFWS, and NOAA Fisheries. Because the feasibility of discharge of tertiary treated water has not been evaluated, if this option is the adopted mitigation for this impact, the applicant shall be required to fund a feasibility assessment including working with permitting agencies to determine if this can be permitted. If determined feasible, the applicant shall fund the CEQA evaluation and the permitting.

Construction of supporting infrastructure (pipes, etc.) and discharge of tertiary treated water into Carmel Lagoon (or the Carmel River) could result in construction period effects on biological resources, air quality, noise, and traffic

and operational effects on water quality, nearby groundwater wells used for drinking water, water-contact recreation in the lagoon or the river, as well as other potential environmental effects. In particular, the water quality effects of using tertiary treated water will require detailed evaluation to identify whether residual elements within the treated water would significantly affect water quality within the lagoon or river, biological resources, or users of water within the lagoon or river. The CEQA evaluation will need to evaluate all potential environmental effects and adopt feasible mitigation for any identified significant impacts. If approved and permitted, the applicant shall fund any necessary infrastructure improvements and the operational costs of providing tertiary treated water in direct proportion to the net increase in summer withdrawal ~~up to 30 AF~~.

The annual discharge of tertiary treated water or discharges under other conditions is outside the obligation of the applicant under this mitigation as would any evaluation of use of secondary treated water.

Because the feasibility and permitting of use of tertiary treated water in Carmel Lagoon remains to be completed, if this mitigation is an adopted mitigation for this project, but is later determined to be infeasible, unapprovable without significant unavoidable impacts, or unpermittable, then the applicant shall instead be responsible to provide additional conservation or increased recycled water use as described below.

b) Additional Conservation Option. If this option is an adopted mitigation for this impact, the applicant shall be responsible to provide ~~an~~ additional ~~41 AF of~~ conservation of potable water to offset the project's increased withdrawal from the Carmel River between June and October of a wet year. The amount of water conservation required under this option shall be in direct proportion to the net increase in summer withdrawal. ~~The 41 AF is the estimated total increase of project demand between June and October.~~ Since Cal-Am uses both the Carmel River aquifer and the Seaside aquifer to provide water to the Del Monte Forest (average split of 75% from the Carmel River and 25% from Seaside Aquifer), the project would need to reduce demand ~~by 41 AF~~ by an amount approximately 133% greater than the net increase in Carmel River withdrawal to offset the impact ~~ensure a reduction of 30 AF in withdrawals from the Carmel River~~. This conservation shall be above and beyond any standard water permit conservation requirements of MPWMD for project development and any existing conservation measures.

Potential conservation measures could include installation of water saving devices such as low-flow shower heads and ultra low-flow toilets, use of drip irrigation to reduce extensive irrigation currently using potable water, provision of tertiary treated water to other users located adjacent to existed treated water lines to replace irrigation using potable water, temporary suspension of potable water using activities (such as swimming pools), or other measures.

The applicant shall submit a conservation proposal to Monterey County demonstrating ~~a~~ water savings measures under wet year conditions between June

and October prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project. The County shall consult with the MPWMD to verify that the proposal will result in the required water savings. Once approved, the additional conservation measures shall be required to be implemented in each wet year. The applicant shall submit an annual report documenting the implementation of these measures in a wet year.

c) Extension of Recycled Water Lines Option. If this option is an adopted mitigation for this impact, the applicant shall be responsible for funding extension of recycled water pipelines to offset the project's increased withdrawal from the Carmel River between June and October of a wet year. Recycled water pipelines shall be extended to allow the offset of potable water use by existing development within the Del Monte Forest, Carmel, and/or Carmel Valley where ultimately determined feasible. Potential opportunities could include other golf courses, athletic fields, and landscaped areas (including commercial and residential properties). The applicant shall pay for construction of the recycled water pipelines, any association pumping facilities, and operational costs in proportion to Project impacts. If subsequent environmental impact analysis is required to implement this option, the applicant shall bear the full cost of such analysis and any associated permitting.

Chapter P2 – Yadon's Piperia

Page P2-9, Line 34 through P2-10 Line 9 are revised as follows:

Assessment of Impact Significance. The occurrence at the Proposed Golf Course location is one of the two largest occurrences of this species known to exist. This occurrence and the Area PQR (Pescadero Canyon) occurrence account for approximately 80% of the known Del Monte Forest population and 66% of the total known population. As noted above, these percentages may overestimate the share of the population found on these two sites, due to dissimilar methodology between the 2004 surveys in the Del Monte Forest and prior surveys outside the Forest. The USFWS Final ~~Draft~~ Recovery Plan for Five Coastal Plant Species on the Monterey Peninsula (USFWS 2004 ~~2002~~) recommends protection of the occurrences at the Proposed Golf Course and Pescadero Canyon "to the maximum extent feasible" and recommends protection of four large populations within the Monterey Peninsula (as feasible), three in the area interior of the Monterey Peninsula and at least five other populations in northern and southern Monterey County (USFWS 2004). "~~six metapopulations, composed of multiple colonies of Yadon's piperia yadonii in each of the two community types in which this species occurs: Monterey pine forest and maritime chaparral~~." The USFWS Final Recovery Plan also recommends that if the two largest populations (Proposed Golf Course and Pescadero Canyon) cannot be protected to the maximum extent feasible, additional areas should be protected in the Monterey Peninsula. The Final Recovery Strategies for Six Coastal Plants on the Monterey Peninsula report prepared for DFG (Jones & Stokes 1996) recommended protection of both of these locations and concluded that retention of more than about 70% of the population within four large

population centers would be likely to ensure survival of the species. The occurrence at the Proposed Golf Course location was also identified in the DFG report as a "valuable location to ensure the long-term viability of the species."

Page P2-14, Line 1 through 15 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-D1-1. Avoidance - Avoid removal of Yadon's piperia within all residential subdivisions, in the path of utility installation to the New Equestrian Center, the recreational trail at F-3, and at the new Equestrian Center.

- Designate building envelopes of maximum size of ~~building envelopes as~~ 0.5 acres for all subdivisions and avoid all extant Yadon's piperia. Development outside the building envelope shall be limited to access roads and utilities and shall also avoid all extant Yadon's piperia. Areas containing Yadon's piperia and forested areas within 50 feet that are not within the building envelope or occupied by roads or utilities shall be dedicated in a negative easement to the Del Monte Forest Foundation to permanently prevent all future development within these areas. This measure would reduce the loss of approximately 1.4 acres containing 34 individuals.

- Utility line installation for the New Equestrian Center shall avoid all identified Yadon's piperia areas.

- Avoid all known Yadon's piperia areas for the routing of the recreational trail at Area F-3.

- A survey for Yadon's piperia will be conducted in the proposed site for the New Equestrian Center in 2005. If Yadon's piperia is identified in any areas that would be directly impacted by construction of the proposed equestrian center and associated infrastructure or temporary equestrian events, the project will be redesigned such that removal of piperia will be avoided. If avoidance is determined to not be feasible by Monterey County, then additional habitat preservation will be required at a 1: 1 ratio with a minimum preservation requirement of 1 acre.

Page P2-16,Line 19 to 21 are revised as follows:

Success Criteria for the Piperia Plan. The primary success criteria for the Piperia Plan is to achieve no net loss of Yadon's piperia due to the Proposed Project in terms of "occupied habitat" as defined below.

The following is added to Mitigation Measure BIO-D1-4 on Page P2-18, after Line 44

Contingency

After five years of Piperia Plan implementation the County will consult with the AMT and determine the level of plan success, and estimate the likelihood of full success within 20 years of plan implementation. If the County determines that additional efforts toward species enhancement are not likely to be successful the applicant will be required to initiate a search for additional lands which can be used to offset the remaining unmitigated loss of habitat at a ratio of 1:1 habitat enhanced or preserved to habitat lost and not mitigated. Mitigation credit would be given for preservation of additional occupied habitat or creation of new occupied habitat through enhancement activities. Funding enhancement activities on existing protected areas (such as Point Lobos State Reserve or Manzanita County Park) or dedication of conservation easements for unprotected areas (owned by the applicant or others) will be acceptable as part of this contingency measure. In order to receive credit for enhancement of an area, the area must be situated in or directly adjacent to a patch of occupied piperia habitat and contain suitable habitat that is at least 1 acre in size. In order to receive credit for preservation, the area must contain a contiguous area containing occupied piperia habitat that is at least 1 acre in size.

After a full ten years of Plan implementation the County will again consult with the AMT and determine the level of plan success and estimate the likelihood of full success within 20 years of plan implementation. If the County can not conclude that efforts toward species enhancement will be successful, it will develop a plan to insure full mitigation through increased efforts or the preservation or enhancement of additional lands. This plan may require the immediate acquisition of land purchase options identified during the five-year review to ensure plan implementation.

After 15 years of Plan implementation if the County can not conclude that full plan success is likely within the full 20 year period and that additional efforts to enhance the species are not sufficient to assure recovery the County, in consultation with the AMT, will prepare a prioritized list of preservation and/or enhancement opportunities based on the following order of priority:

- Within the Del Monte Forest
- Within the Monterey Peninsula
- Within Yadon's piperia's known range

Based on the prioritized list, the applicant shall develop an enhancement and/or preservation proposal for review and approval by Monterey County (in consultation with the AMT). This contingency mitigation will be sufficient to offset the remaining unmitigated loss of habitat at a ratio of 1:1 habitat enhanced

or preserved to habitat lost and not mitigated. Success criteria for enhancement will be as described above.

Chapter P3 – Green Trail from HHNA to Spanish Bay

Page P3-6, line 31 through P3-8 Line 2 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-A6. Implement measures to protect Sawmill Gulch, wetlands, remnant dunes and other sensitive biological resources along the Green Trail between Congress Road and Spanish Bay from substantial disruption due to increased equestrian use. Implement trail safety measures at Green Trail road crossings and along golf course fairways.

The following shall be completed prior to issuance of any grading permit for the New Equestrian Center:

- The applicant shall design either a re-route around the wetland just south of Colton Road or an elevated trail (e.g. a boardwalk) to avoid encroachment into the wetland area itself.
- The applicant shall design an elevated clear-span bridge structure to avoid encroachment into Sawmill Gulch at the crossing near Mission Court.
- The applicant shall obtain necessary permits from the CDFG, USACE, or RWQCB if the trail improvements would result in encroachment into ESHA and non-ESHA jurisdictional (Corps or California Coastal Act) wetland areas. If any wetland or riparian areas must be disturbed in order to construct the bridge, the applicant shall replace any temporary or permanent loss by restoration of wetland and/or riparian areas within Sawmill Gulch to avoid any net loss of habitat.

The following measures shall be completed prior to boarding of any horses at the New Equestrian Center:

- The applicant shall fund and construct the approved trail improvements near the wetlands south of Colton Road.
- The applicant shall fund and construct the approved trail improvements for the Sawmill Gulch crossing near Mission Court.

The following measures shall be implemented once horses are boarded at the New Equestrian Center

- The applicant shall be responsible for an annual program of erosion control and trail maintenance along the Green Trail between Congress

Road and Spanish Bay. The applicant shall monitor the Green Trail during the wet season, temporarily close the trail to equestrian use when monitoring identifies that a substantial erosion potential exists, and conduct periodic maintenance as necessary to prevent soil erosion and sedimentation from subsequent storm events.

- The applicant shall conduct at least annual (and more frequent if necessary) weed control surveys of the Green Trail between Congress Road and Spanish Bay and use manual, mechanical, and appropriate means of control where infestation of noxious weeds is identified.

- The applicant shall extend the requirements of DEIR Mitigation Measure HWQ-C3 to Sawmill Gulch between Congress Road and Spanish Bay. The measure requires the implementation of stream and wetland water quality monitoring, and identification and implementation of additional control measures if monitoring shows a substantial increase in nutrients resulting from animal waste along trails.

- The applicant shall permanently close and revegetate any informal "social" trails along this portion of the Green Trail between Congress Road and Spanish Bay, provided permission is granted by the underlying landowner.

- The applicant shall maintain the existing barriers along the dune habitat near Spanish Bay.

- The applicant shall incorporate environmental education about the sensitive resources along the Green Trail to all trail users and attendees at special events including measures that individuals can implement to lower their impact such as not hitching horses to trees, crossing drainages at marked crossings, staying on designated trails, and use of ~~noxious~~ certified weed-free feed (when such feed becomes commercially available).

The applicant shall incorporate these measures into a supplemental portion of the site-specific RMP for the HHNA.

The following trail safety measures shall also be implemented prior to boarding of horses at the New Equestrian Center:

- Improve Green Trail crossings at Congress Road and Sloat Road – Provide striping of an equestrian/pedestrian crossing with signage along the road approaches to each of these trail crossings.

- Improve Green Trail alignment/crossing of Colton Road – provide a trail segment separated from Colton Road by a positive physical barrier (curb, fence, etc.) for safe pedestrian and equestrian access from the point where Green Trail approaches Colton Road from the south, to where the Green Trail leaves Colton Road to the north. Provide signage along the approaches to where the trail segment parallels Colton Road. Provide a

striped crossing of Colton Road from the south side to the north side at the location with greatest sight distance. Submit improvement plan to Monterey County Public Works for road safety review. Avoid vegetation removal, if feasible. If vegetation removal required, submit improvement proposal and mitigation plan to Monterey County review and approval and for any necessary permit and supplemental environmental review.

- Improve trail safety along MPCC golf course – Applicant shall work with the MPCC to identify and implement any needed safety improvements of the Green Trail along MPCC to control potential horse/golf conflicts. Safety improvements could include landscaping, marking, signage, or other measures as determined necessary. Avoid vegetation removal, if feasible. If vegetation removal required, submit improvement proposal and mitigation plan to Monterey County for review and approval and for any necessary permit and supplemental environmental review.

Chapter P4 – Transportation and Circulation

Page P4-4 line 13 is revised as follows:

This analysis is focused on peak hour trips for a typical weekday.

Page P4-4 Line 19 is revised as follows

Thus relative to special events, the project is not identified to contribute any new or additional traffic beyond existing conditions.

Page P4-6 Line 9 through P4-7 Line 4 are revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure TC-B3. The applicant shall be responsible for payment of a fair-share traffic impact fee for various improvements to Highway 1, Highway 68 (Salinas to Monterey), Highway 101, and Highway 156 and/or a regional traffic impact fee if one is later adopted by TAMC prior to construction of the Proposed Project. Proposed improvements along the highway corridors were identified from a review of Caltrans project study reports (Dokken Engineering 2001, Mark Thomas 2002), the Highway 68 Action Plan (Highway 68 Improvement Advisory Committee 2000), prior traffic studies (Higgins Associates 2004a and 2004b) and material from TAMC (DKS 2004). The total costs of identified improvements were derived from existing sources.

With the exception of Highway 1 south of Pebble Beach, the project's fair-share was estimated by dividing the project's PM peak hour trip contribution to deficient or failed operations by the total cumulative volume on the relevant portion of the highway corridor and then multiplying the resultant percentage times the total cost. Thus, for example, if the cumulative total PM peak volume were 1000 trips, the project contributed 10 trips, and the identified improvements

cost $1,000,000, then the project's fair share would be 10/1000 = 1%; 1% X $1,000,000 = $10,000.

For Highway 1 south of Pebble Beach, Caltrans recently completed a draft Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR/PDS) for Highway 1 between the Carmel River bridge and the Highway 68/Holman Highway interchange (Dokken Engineering 2001). TAMC and Monterey County have since begun administering an impact fee on all projects adding vehicle trips to this section of Highway 1 to fund the PSR/PDS improvements. As of November 2002, this impact fee was $2,033 per average daily trip and is adjusted monthly based upon the relative change in the Construction Cost Index published by the *Engineering News Record*. Approximately 5% of the total 2,918 daily trips generated by the project are added to Highway 1 in the greater Carmel area, or a total of 141 daily trips. The Proposed Project would therefore be responsible for a total Highway 1 PSR traffic impact fee of 141 x $2,033 = $286,650, based upon the November 2002 fee rate. This fee should be adjusted based upon the Construction Cost Index at the time of payment.

The fair-share mitigation fees identified in Table P4-2 shall be paid by the applicant to the responsible collecting agency for the specific improvements (such as Caltrans, Monterey County, or TAMC) prior to the construction of any element of the Proposed Project, except the proposed road improvements (including the Highway 1/68 improvements). The required fees shall be adjusted based upon the Construction Cost Index published by the *Engineering News Record* at the time of payment. If TAMC adopts a regional impact fee program prior to the construction of the Proposed Project, then the applicant shall be responsible for payment of a regional impact fee using the adopted methodology in lieu of the fees identified in Table P4-2 <u>that are related to projects that are included in the regional fee program. If a project (or projects) listed in Table P4-2 is/are not included in a regional fee program, the applicant will be responsible to pay the fair-share fee for that project (or projects) as well as the regional fee.</u>

Chapter P5 – Long-Term Noise

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Chapter P6 – Growth Inducement

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Chapter P7 – Cumulative Impacts

The table following page P7-3 is revised relative to the summary of Mitigation Measure TC-B3(C) as follows:

The applicant would be responsible for payment of a traffic impact fee ~~for the Highway 1 Project Study Report Improvements~~ for planned improvements to certain regional highway segments and intersections.

Chapter P8 – Report Preparation

The following list of agencies, organizations, and persons consulted in the preparation of the PRDEIR is added to the end of Chapter P8.

List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Consulted

Federal Agencies

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

State Agencies

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 5
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
State Water Resources Control Board, Water Rights Division (SWRCB)

Local Agencies

Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD)
Monterey County Environmental Health Division
Monterey County Water Resources Agency
MPWMD - Monterey Peninsula Water Management Agency
Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD)

Organizations

California-America Water Company
Monterey Pine Forest Watch (MPFW)

Individuals

Win U., Ph.D., CSU Monterey Bay
Yadon, Vern

Applicant and Consultants

Denise Duffy & Associates
Fehr & Peers
Lombardo & Gilles
Pebble Beach Company (PBC)
WWD Corporation
Zander & Associates

Chapter P9 – References Cited

The following reference is added:

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2004. Recovery Plan for Five Plants from Monterey County, CA. Portland, OR.

Appendix B – Traffic

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Appendix E – Biological Resources

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Appendix F – Internal Roadway Improvement Plans

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Appendix G – Potable and Reclaimed Water Demand Calculations

A new Table G2-5F2 has been added to assess the maximum amount of the applicant's entitlement that can be transferred without resulting in the need for Mitigation Measure PSU-D3. (see new table below)

Appendix I - Revisions to Draft TEAM Plan for Yadon's Piperia (August 2004)

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Table G.2-5F2
Monthly Demands Existing and With Project/Phase II, Wet Year
(Scenario 3C, acre-feet)

	A	B	C	D	E	G	H
Month	**Existing Potable Use**	**Existing Recycled Use**	**Existing Total Use (A+B)**	**Project/Phase II Potable**	**Change in Potable Use (A-D)**	**Change in Carmel River Use (E*75%)**	**Change in Seaside Basin Use (E*25%)**
October	35.5	56.6	92.1	18.2	-17.3	-12.6	-4.7
November	1.5	15.0	16.5	10.5	9.0	6.5	2.4
December	0.4	1.7	2.1	9.0	8.6	6.3	2.3
January	0.0	1.3	1.3	8.9	8.9	6.5	2.4
February	0.6	1.7	2.3	9.0	8.4	6.1	2.3
March	2.3	1.6	3.9	9.2	6.9	5.1	1.9
April	15.8	27.1	42.9	13.2	-2.7	-1.9	-0.7
May	15.4	54.7	70.1	15.9	0.5	0.4	0.1
June	23.0	97.2	120.2	21.0	-2.0	-1.4	-0.5
July	18.7	127.1	145.8	23.6	4.9	3.6	1.3
August	18.5	120.2	138.8	22.9	4.4	3.2	1.2
September	12.4	98.3	110.7	20.1	7.6	5.6	2.1
TOTAL	144.1	602.4	746.6	181.4	37.3	27.2	10.1
Nov-May						29.0	10.7
Jun- Oct.						**-1.7**	-0.6
			Total	*Irrigation Assumption*	*Irrigation Use*	*Base Use*	*Base Monthly*
Project			86.4	1/3 of total	28.5	57.9	4.8
Phase II			95.0	1/2 of total	47.5	47.5	4.0
Total			181.4		76.0	105.4	8.8

Notes: Table shows how it was determined that a maximum of 100 AF of the applicant's entitlement could be sold and conveyed without resulting in a net increase in Carmel River withdrawals during the dry (June to October) period of a wet year. Existing potable, recycled, and total use is by reclaimed water users within the Del Monte Forest based on PRDEIR Table G.1-4C. The project use total (86 AF) is from PRDEIR Table G.2-2A. The Phase II use total (95 AF) is 95% of 100AF, which is presumed total for an average year if 100 AF of the applicant's entitlement is sold. The project irrigation assumption was made based on review of project potable use by type (see PRDEIR Table G.2-2D). The Phase II user irrigation assumption was based on review of literature concerning average residential use patterns. Base use is non-irrigation potable uses and is presumed to be constant over the year. Irrigation use was distributed by monthly percentage of existing total use (Column C).

Appendix J - Bristol Curve Noise Study

No revisions made pursuant to comment.

Appendix K - Recycled Water Project Phase II Environmental Documents

No revisions made pursuant to comment.