
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
C-1-T ZONE CONDOMINIUM ORDINANCE PROJECT
INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Prepared for:

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 FOREST AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950

Prepared by:

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL
500 12TH STREET, SUITE 250
OAKLAND, CA 94607

SEPTEMBER 2015

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and Regulatory Guidance.....1.0-1
1.2 Lead Agency.....1.0-1
1.3 Purpose and Document Organization.....1.0-1
1.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....1.0-2

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Location.....3.0-1
3.2 Project Characteristics.....3.0-1
3.3 Project Approvals.....3.0-4
3.4 Relationship of Project to Other Plans.....3.0-4

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Aesthetics.....4.0-1
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.....4.0-4
3. Air Quality.....4.0-6
4. Biological Resources.....4.0-9
5. Cultural Resources.....4.0-12
6. Geology and Soils.....4.0-15
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....4.0-18
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....4.0-20
9. Hydrology and Water Quality.....4.0-23
10. Land Use and Planning.....4.0-26
11. Mineral Resources.....4.0-27
12. Noise.....4.0-28
13. Population and Housing.....4.0-30
14. Public Services.....4.0-32
15. Recreation.....4.0-34
16. Transportation/Traffic.....4.0-35
17. Utilities and Service Systems.....4.0-38
18. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....4.0-40

5.0 REFERENCES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This document contains an initial study, with supporting environmental studies, which concludes that a negative declaration is the appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document for the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance Project (proposed project). This negative declaration has been prepared in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.

An initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if an initial study indicates that the proposed project under review may have a potentially significant impact on the environment that cannot be initially avoided or mitigated to a level that is less than significant. A negative declaration may be prepared if the lead agency also prepares a written statement describing the reasons why the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore why it does not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a negative declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

- (a) *The initial study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, or*
- (b) *The initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but:*
 - (1) *Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and*
 - (2) *There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.*

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over a proposed project. Where two or more public agencies will be involved with a project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15051 provides criteria for identifying the lead agency. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b) (1), "the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." Based on the criteria above, the City of Pacific Grove (City) is the lead agency for the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance Project.

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this Initial Study is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance Project. This document is divided into the following sections:

1.0 Introduction – This section provides an introduction and describes the purpose and organization of the document.

2.0 Project Information – This section provides general information regarding the project, including the project title, lead agency and address, contact person, brief description of the project location, General

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Plan land use designation and zoning district, identification of surrounding land uses, and identification of other public agencies whose review, approval, and/or permits may be required. Also listed in this section is a checklist of the environmental factors that are potentially affected by the project.

3.0 Project Description – This section provides a detailed description of the proposed project.

4.0 Environmental Checklist – This section describes the environmental setting and overview for each of the environmental subject areas, and evaluates a range of impacts classified as “no impact,” “less than significant impact,” “less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated,” and “potentially significant impact” in response to the environmental checklist.

5.0 References – This section identifies documents, websites, people, and other sources consulted during the preparation of this Initial Study.

1.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 4.0, Environmental Checklist, is the analysis portion of this Initial Study. The section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the project. Section 4.0 includes 18 environmental issue subsections, including CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. The environmental issue subsections, numbered 1 through 18, consist of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Aesthetics | 10. Land Use and Planning |
| 2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources | 11. Mineral Resources |
| 3. Air Quality | 12. Noise |
| 4. Biological Resources | 13. Population and Housing |
| 5. Cultural Resources | 14. Public Services |
| 6. Geology and Soils | 15. Recreation |
| 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 16. Transportation/Traffic |
| 8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 17. Utilities and Service Systems |
| 9. Hydrology and Water Quality | 18. Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Each environmental issue subsection is organized in the following manner:

The **Discussion of Impacts** provides a detailed discussion of each environmental issue checklist question and a brief setting statement. The level of significance for each topic is determined by considering the predicted magnitude of the impact. Four levels of impact significance are evaluated in this Initial Study:

No Impact: No project-related impact on the environment would occur with project development.

Less Than Significant Impact: The impact would not result in a substantial adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that may have a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the

area affected by the project” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). However, the incorporation of mitigation measures that are specified after analysis would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that is “potentially significant” but for which mitigation measures cannot be immediately suggested or the effectiveness of potential mitigation measures cannot be determined with certainty, because more in-depth analysis of the issue and potential impact is needed. In such cases, an EIR is required.

This page intentionally left blank

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

- 1. Project title:** C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance Project
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** City of Pacific Grove
300 Forest Avenue, 2nd Floor
Pacific Grove, CA 94806
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Mark Brodeur, Director
Community & Economic Development Department
(831) 648-3189
- 4. Project location:** The project consists of a zoning ordinance in the City of Pacific Grove.
- 5. Project sponsor’s name and address:** City of Pacific Grove
- 6. General Plan designation:** Medium Density Residential and Commercial
- 7. Zoning:** C-1-T (Light Commercial/Hotel/Condominium)
- 8. Project description:** The project constitutes the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance that would allow for light commercial, hotel, and condominium uses to be developed in the C-1-T zone of Pacific Grove.
- 9. Project area setting:** The project area would encompass the C-1-T Zone in the City of Pacific Grove.

10. Environmental factors potentially affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “potentially significant impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

11. Determination: (To be completed by the lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Mark Brodeur
Printed Name

Director
Title

City of Pacific Grove
Lead Agency

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

Pacific Grove is a coastal community located on the Monterey Peninsula in Monterey County, California. The city was established in the late 1800s as a Methodist Retreat Center and incorporated in 1889. Pacific Grove is characterized by the historic downtown and residential neighborhoods and dramatic ocean views. The city covers 2.8 square miles and is bounded by Pebble Beach to the southwest, Monterey to the southeast, the Monterey Bay to the northeast, and the Pacific Ocean to the northwest. Pacific Grove is located approximately 15 miles to the southwest of Salinas and 50 miles to the southwest of San Jose.

Pacific Grove currently (2015) has a population of 15,552, with a median household income of \$50,254. The city is known for over 1,200 historic homes, with a large percentage of homes (25.9 percent) built before 1939. The city is mainly built out with little open space for future development. Most development in the city takes place on infill lots and in the form of redevelopment. This is reflected in the number of structures built between 1990 and 2000—approximately 258, or 3.5 percent of the housing stock in the city (Pacific Grove 2015).

The zoning ordinance would apply to the C-1-T zoning district which is bounded by Lighthouse Avenue, Grand Avenue, Central Avenue and Fountain Ave. The block currently is developed with one building located at 452 Lighthouse Avenue, referred to as the Holman Building, which is on the City's Historic Resources Inventory, a second building located at 157 Grand Avenue, referred to as either Grand Central Station or the Holman Garage and is of undetermined historic status, and a surface parking located centrally located on the block.

3.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The project involves the adoption and codification of the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance (project) (**Appendix A**) per Table 23.31.030 End Note 6. The ordinance would be codified as Title 23.32 of the City of Pacific Grove Municipal Code. The project would allow condominium development in Pacific Grove with an emphasis on the C-1-T (Light Commercial/Hotel/Condominium) district along with a variety of other light commercial and hotel uses. Allowing condominium development would help the City accomplish General Plan goals of adequately planning for growth while maintaining the city's character and aesthetics.

The purpose of the ordinance as cited in Section 23.32.010 is to:

create controls for residential and commercial condominium development within the C-1-T zone as it is recognized that the condominium form of property ownership creates unique problems relating to the land use, aesthetic, social, and economic environment of the city. Therefore, it is the purpose of this chapter to accomplish the following:

- (a) Assure adequate maintenance of condominiums, as their fragmented ownership may result in conditions of disrepair that are inimical to the public health, safety, and welfare.*
- (b) Assure each condominium project is capable of satisfying the more demanding physical needs of long-term owners in contract to the lesser expectations of short-term rental occupants.*
- (c) Provide for maintenance of rental units within projects that are converted, especially for the disabled and elderly.*

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(d) This chapter shall apply exclusively to properties within the C-1-T zone and shall have no force or effect in any other location in the City of Pacific Grove.

The project would be subject to the provisions of Chapter 23.64 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code unless provisions of this chapter conflict with the Chapter 23.64, in which event the project provisions would prevail. Further, the projects approved under the condominium ordinance would need to comply with all applicable city and state regulations. The ordinance requires certificate of use and occupancy requirements as well as conditions prerequisite to issuance. Proposed projects would need to demonstrate that:

- The proposed density and design characteristics of the buildings and grounds are in conformance with the City's General Plan and comply with the zoning ordinance.
- All violations of the current codes described in Municipal Code Section 18.04.010 have been corrected and any equipment or facilities which the chief building inspector determines are deteriorated or hazardous are replaced.
- The project complies with all provisions of the Subdivision Map Act and Pacific Grove Municipal Code Title 24, if applicable, including Municipal Code Section 24.72.030(a) and (b) and Section 24.72.060(e).

The condominium ordinance also outlines the following application requirements:

1. The location, heights, gross floor area, and proposed uses for each floor within each structure.
2. The description of each unit in sufficient legal description and all rights, obligations, and interests bound to each unit.
3. The designation as to which areas and units are dedicated to separate condominium ownership and which areas are dedicated to common ownership and use.
4. The designation as to whether each unit is limited to residential or commercial use.
5. The location for a public meeting room for use by the owners associations and the City of Pacific Grove.
6. The location, use, and type of surfacing for all storage areas.
7. The location of any and all common elements and equipment, including but not limited to HVAC, elevators, gates and doors, and public features.
8. The location and type of surfacing for all driveways, pedestrian ways, vehicle parking areas, curb cuts, and points of access.
9. The location and size of all parking facilities to be used in conjunction with each condominium unit.
10. The location, height, and type of materials for any walls or fences.

11. The location of all landscaped areas, the type of landscaping, and a statement specifying the method by which the landscaped areas will be maintained.
12. The location and description of all common facilities and a statement specifying the method of the maintenance thereof.
13. The location and description of all common ingress and egress into the building;
14. The location, type and size of all drainage pipes and structures depicted or described to the nearest public drain or watercourse.
15. The maximum height of the finished rooftop.
16. The location, type, and size of all on-site and adjacent street overhead utility lines.
17. Balconies designed to serve a single unit, but located outside the unit's boundaries.
18. Existing and proposed exterior elevations.
19. All rooftop wireless facilities, and any screening related to those features.
20. The location of and provisions for any unique site features.

The condominium ordinance also establishes minimum necessary standards to ensure that the project's purpose and objectives are accomplished. For example, the project requires the following:

- (b) Unit Size. *The enclosed living or habitable area of each residential condominium unit shall be not less than 1,000 square feet exclusive of storage under subsection (f) of this section.*
- (c) Fire Prevention. *The living or habitable area of each residential and commercial condominium unit shall comply with all provisions of the California Fire Code as adopted by Chapter 18.32 PGMC.*
- (d) Sound Transmission. *Wall and floor-ceiling assemblies shall conform to Title 25, California Administrative Code, Section 1092, or its successor, or permanent mechanical equipment, including domestic appliances, which is determined by the chief building inspector to be a potential source of vibration or noise, shall be shock mounted, isolated from the floor and ceiling, or otherwise installed in a manner approved by the chief building inspector to lessen the transmission of vibration and noise. Floor covering may only be replaced by another floor covering that provides the same or greater insulation.*
- (e) Utilities and Utility Metering.
 - (1) *The consumption of gas and electricity within each condominium unit shall be separately metered so that the unit can be separately billed for each utility. A water shut-off valve shall be provided for each unit or for each plumbing fixture. Each unit shall have access to each meter and heater for the unit without entry through another unit.*

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- (2) *Each condominium unit shall have its own panel, and access thereto, for all electrical circuits which serve the unit.*
- (3) *Each condominium unit shall have conduits or other passages for optical fiber or copper connection to CATV, phone, and internet lines.*
- (4) *Each condominium unit shall be plumbed for purple pipe/recycled water.*
- (k) *Parking Standards. Off-street parking requirements for each condominium unit shall be one point three (1.3) covered parking space per unit plus the shared use of the fourteen spaces provided immediately adjacent for visitors to the Holman Building. Discrete or dedicated parking spaces shall not be delineated for commercial condominium owners or customers.*
- (l) *CC&Rs. The Community and Economic Development Director shall approve all CC&Rs for residential or commercial condominium units before any condominium unit shall be sold.*

The project further sets standards for the condominium owners association and organizational documents.

3.3 PROJECT APPROVALS

As the lead agency, the City of Pacific Grove has the ultimate authority for project approval or denial. The proposed project may require the following discretionary approvals by the City for actions proposed as part of the project:

- Adopt the Initial Study/Negative Declaration
- Approve and adopt the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance

3.4 RELATIONSHIP OF PROJECT TO OTHER PLANS

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE GENERAL PLAN

The City's General Plan was adopted in 1994 and represents the City's vision for guiding future conservation and development in Pacific Grove. The General Plan is organized in the following chapters: Land Use; Housing; Transportation; Parks and Recreation; Natural Resources; Historic and Archaeological Resources; Urban Structure and Design; Public Facilities; and Health and Safety. The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance is in compliance with General Plan goals of supporting growth in an organized manner.

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ZONING CODE

The purpose of the zoning code is to promote growth and development in Pacific Grove. The zoning code establishes zoning districts and regulations for the use of land and development for properties in the city. The zoning code specifies the areas where specific land uses may be located and sets standards for their development to ensure the safe and efficient functioning of all uses. The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance would be in compliance with the Municipal Code Table 23.31.030 End Note 6 and Chapter 23.29.

Both of these documents have been incorporated by reference in the Initial Study/Negative Declaration.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

As outlined in the City of Pacific Grove General Plan (1994), the city is well known for its Victorian homes, dramatic coastline, urban forests, Asilomar State Beach, and sweeping views of the Pacific Ocean. Pacific Grove is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the City of Monterey to the east, and the Monterey Bay and the Del Monte Forest to the north and south, respectively. There are two main vehicular entrances to the city: State Route 68 (Holman Highway) from the south and Central Avenue from the east. David Avenue, Prescott Lane, and Ocean View Boulevard are the other major entrances from Monterey.

Per Chapter 8, Urban Structure and Design, of the Pacific Grove General Plan, the city is divided into seven areas. Each area is relatively homogenous geographically with three dominant factors: dominant landscape or seascape, topography, and predominant land use. The areas are as follows:

- The Coastal Corridor: Approximately 4 linear miles of the coastal corridor extend west along Ocean View Boulevard from the city boundary near David Avenue to Point Pinos and continue south along Sunset Drive to the southern end of the Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds.
- Forest Lands: Much of the area is located east of Asilomar Avenue and west of 17 Mile Drive.
- Lawns and Golf Course: Confined primarily to the Municipal Golf Course, the cemetery, school playing fields, and a number of small parks including Jewell Park, Berwick Park, Caledonia Park, and Lovers Point Park.
- Historic Downtown: Pacific Grove’s downtown is located along Lighthouse Avenue, between Cypress Avenue and 12th Street, and on Forest Avenue between Central and Pine avenues.
- Historic Residential: Although homes of historic value are found throughout the city, the majority are located near the historic commercial core. The historic residential area is generally bounded by Junipero Avenue, 1st Street, Ocean View Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, and Alder Street.

- Non-Historic Residential Area: Most of Pacific Grove's housing is in this area. It includes most of the residential development south of Junipero Avenue and west of Alder Street, and the residential development both north and south of the Municipal Golf Course.

The City of Pacific Grove adopted a Historic Context Statement in 2011, which looked at the history of the city, its important structures, and the delineation of its neighborhoods. The new document describes the city in terms of four periods of development:

- Development of the Retreat (1873–1902)
- PG Comes of Age (1903–1926)
- City of Homes (1927–1945)
- Expanding into the Hills (1946–1966)

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the condominium ordinance.

Indirect impacts resulting from future development approved under the condominium ordinance could impact scenic vistas. Future development would undergo additional environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure that scenic vistas are not impacted. Further, development would also be subject to compliance with strategies and actions included in the General Plan Urban Structure and Design chapter that seeks to enhance the city's visual image and livability. These regulations and guidelines are intended to diminish conflicts between public and private spaces. Future development permitted under the proposed condominium ordinance is not anticipated to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the development sites and their surroundings.

Therefore, the ordinance would result in less than significant impacts with regard to effects on a scenic vista.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no state scenic highways located in the project area. State Route (SR) 68 runs through Pacific Grove and is eligible for designation under the State Scenic Highway System. SR 68 begins as Asilomar Avenue in Pacific Grove at an intersection with Lighthouse Avenue, near the Point Pinos Lighthouse. The highway continues south to an intersection with Sunset Drive, turning east on Sunset Drive before continuing south after roughly half a mile onto Forest Avenue. Soon after entering Monterey and passing by the Presidio of Monterey, SR 68 becomes the Holman Highway until its junction with SR 1 at the terminus of 17 Mile Drive.

Since there are no state scenic highways in Pacific Grove, the condominium ordinance would not directly or indirectly impact visual resources within a state scenic highway. Further, any future discretionary development projects approved under the condominium ordinance would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions, and would need to comply with City of Pacific Grove regulations. Therefore, adoption of the condominium ordinance would result in less than significant impacts with regard to effects on visual resources within a state scenic highway.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Development permitted by the condominium ordinance would intensify use in some areas through infill construction. Given that the city is primarily a built-out area, any future development permitted by the condominium ordinance would occur primarily as infill and redevelopment. As such, adoption of the condominium ordinance would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the development sites and their surroundings.

Nonetheless, future development permitted under the ordinance could alter the visual character of the respective development sites and their surroundings, primarily in areas containing historic resources. The General Plan EIR (1994) discusses the lack of vacant land for future development and anticipates much of the growth that would occur with implementation to occur as infill. The General Plan EIR concluded that the General Plan provides strategies and actions that would promote quality development and design throughout the city, which would reduce potential impacts to visual quality to less than significant levels.

Additionally, future projects would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure that the existing visual character of the development sites and their surroundings is not substantially degraded. Future development would also be subject to compliance with strategies and actions included in the General Plan Urban Structure and Design Chapter that seeks to enhance the city's visual image and livability. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are two primary sources of night light pollution: light emanating from building interiors that pass through windows and light from exterior sources (i.e., street lighting, parking lot lighting, building illumination, security lighting, and landscape lighting). Depending on the location of the light source and its proximity to adjacent light-sensitive uses, light introduction can be a nuisance, affecting adjacent areas and diminishing the view of the clear night sky.

Pacific Grove is primarily built-out; therefore, ambient light from urban uses currently exists. New development under the condominium ordinance could create new sources of light and glare, which could affect day or nighttime views of the respective development areas. Any future discretionary development projects or land use decisions undertaken under the condominium ordinance would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, which would include an analysis of potential light and glare impact. Future development would also be subject to compliance with strategies and actions included in the General Plan Urban Structure and Design Chapter. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Pacific Grove does not contain any agricultural or forest resources, as it is characterized by urban-style development and is generally built out.

- a) **No Impact.** There is no designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the city. Therefore, adoption of the condominium ordinance would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. The ordinance would have no impact.
- b) **No Impact.** There are no agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts present in the city. Therefore, adoption of the condominium ordinance would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and would have no impact.
- c) **No Impact.** There is no zoning for forestland in Pacific Grove. Additionally, the city is primarily a built-out area, and it is anticipated that future development permitted by the proposed condominium ordinance would generally consist of infill and redevelopment. Therefore, adoption of the ordinance

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland. There would be no impact.

- d) **No Impact.** There are no forestlands present in the city. Therefore, adoption of the condominium ordinance would not result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

- e) **No Impact.** No farmland, agricultural activity, or forestlands exist in Pacific Grove. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would not result in environmental changes that would convert farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Pacific Grove is in the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB), which comprises Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey counties. This air basin is monitored, evaluated, and controlled by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). The EPA and CARB have established the air basins in California that are in attainment or nonattainment of ambient air quality standards for the various criteria pollutants. Ambient air quality standards have been designated to protect public health and the environment. A nonattainment designation of an air pollutant means that ambient pollutant concentrations in the air basin exceed the federal or state ambient air quality standards for that pollutant. The NCCAB is found to be in attainment with EPA standards for all selected pollutants and in nonattainment with state standards for ozone (O₃) and inhalable particulates (PM₁₀).

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** On April 17, 2013, the MBUAPCD adopted the Triennial Plan Revision for 2009–2011, which documents the district’s progress toward attaining the state ozone standard and is the district’s review and update to the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The district has also adopted CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to assist in the review and evaluation of air quality impacts from projects which are subject to CEQA. The guidelines establish thresholds of significance for both construction and operational emissions for air pollutants of concern.

The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts on applicable air quality standards would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Further, all future development projects would be required to comply with existing MBUAPCD regulations and permitting requirements. Compliance with regulations and permit requirements would ensure that new uses reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to verify consistency with the AQMP. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review,

be regulated by current regulations, and be subject to compliance with General Plan strategies and actions, impacts involving consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts on air quality standards would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development permitted by the ordinance would occur primarily as infill and redevelopment. However, construction activities would generate pollutant emissions, including but not limited to operation of construction equipment, and vehicle activities. Future development permitted by the condominium ordinance would also generate pollutant emissions from stationary equipment, new vehicular trips, and off-site power. Because the proposed condominium ordinance involves a programmatic project, no emissions calculations are necessary in the preparation of this document.

However, future development permitted under the new ordinance could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. As such, future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to determine air emissions and potential violations of air quality standards. Future projects would follow MBUAPCD criteria for construction and operational emissions and would be required to demonstrate compliance with the applicable AQMP. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review, be regulated by current regulations, and be subject to compliance with MBUAPCD regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Please see responses to (a) and (b) above.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis.

Sensitive receptors are located throughout the city. The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts on sensitive receptors would occur from adoption of the ordinance.

However, the construction of individual projects approved under the condominium ordinance could potentially lead to fugitive emissions and other pollutants affecting sensitive land uses. Increased traffic volumes on city streets could also lead to increases in traffic congestion and associated vehicle emissions, which could impact sensitive receptors. As such, potential impacts from future development permitted by the condominium ordinance would involve potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Nonetheless, future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to determine pollutant concentrations and impacts on sensitive receptors. More specifically, future development may be required to prepare an air quality analysis that evaluates the air emission impacts during construction. The project-specific air quality analysis would provide mitigation measures to offset impacts associated with that development if needed. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review, potential impacts involving the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Odors would be considered significant if the project would result in frequent exposure of members of the public to objectionable odors, which is typically defined as five or more confirmed complaints per year averaged over three years. The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts regarding odors would occur from adoption of the ordinance.

Construction activity from future development permitted by the condominium ordinance may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. Construction-related odors would be short term in nature and cease upon project completion. Operational impacts would also be analyzed on a project-by-project basis as required by environmental regulations. As such, project impacts as they relate to odors would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Pacific Grove is located in the Central California Coast ecological section of the California Coastal Chaparral Forest and Shrub ecological province (McNab et al. 2007). The climate in this section is modified greatly by marine influences. The regional landscape around the city consists of parallel ranges and valleys associated with the southern Coast Ranges of California with elevations ranging from sea level to 3,800 feet (1,160 meters) above mean sea level (McNab et al. 2007). Rock formations are derived from a mix of marine and nonmarine sedimentary rocks and alluvial deposits as well as granitic and ultramafic rocks. Common natural communities in the region include oak woodland, grassland, chaparral, and coniferous forest (McNab et al. 2007). Saltwater marshes occur along the coast, and numerous slow- and fast-moving streams occur in the region. The Central California Coast section is subdivided into 12 subsections, including the North Coastal Santa Lucia Range subsection.

Pacific Grove is located in the North Coastal Santa Lucia Range ecological subsection, comprising the northern part of the Santa Lucia Range, specifically on the coastal side of the range between the Salinas

Valley and the Pacific Ocean. Soils are predominantly well drained. Natural vegetation communities include a mix of coniferous forest, oak woodland, chaparral, and grassland. The climate is hot to temperate and subhumid to humid, characterized by mean annual temperatures between 50° and 58° Fahrenheit and 16–60 inches of precipitation annually that falls as rain. Runoff is rapid, and many streams are generally dry during summer.

As underlined in the City of Pacific Grove General Plan Natural Resources Chapter, the city contains numerous endangered, special-status, and protected species. The General Plan outlines several policies to protect endangered species as well as goals to protect the city's biological resources and diversity. Additionally, the City's Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan includes an area designated Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESHA).

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As outlined above, Pacific Grove contains species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts on such resources would occur from adoption of the ordinance.

However, construction of individual projects approved under the condominium ordinance could potentially lead to habitat modification and species that are deemed sensitive or special-status. An increased pace of urbanization is identified as impacting sensitive species habitats in the City's General Plan. Nonetheless, future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to determine impacts on sensitive biological resources. More specifically, future development may be required to conduct preconstruction surveys and implement monitoring of special-status species if present on-site. Subsequent projects would comply with federal, state, and local regulation as they pertain to sensitive biological resources. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review, adoption of the condominium ordinance would result in less than significant impacts with regard to an effect on habitat modifications and any species that are deemed sensitive or special-status.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. The proposed condominium ordinance does not include any development projects, and any future discretionary development projects or land use changes would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. The condominium ordinance would not have any effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. Adoption of the ordinance would not result in the loss of jurisdictional waters of the State or waters of the United States. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. Any future discretionary development projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts with regard to effects on federally protected wetlands.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. Adoption of the condominium ordinance would not directly interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Any future discretionary development projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. The condominium ordinance would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The proposed ordinance does not include any development projects. Any future discretionary land use decisions would be subject to environmental review and mitigation under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance would not conflict with provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Any indirect impacts that could occur from ordinance adoption would be determined on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Pacific Grove was originally established as a religious retreat. Attendees of the 1872 California Annual Conference of the Methodist Church formally started discussing establishing a West Coast campground, and in 1874, a committee was created to investigate the formation of a retreat on the West Coast. Subsequently, on June 15, 1875, the Methodist Episcopal Church filed articles of incorporation for the Pacific Grove Retreat Association. In July 1875, a survey map of the Pacific Grove Retreat was filed with the Monterey County Recorder’s Office (Pacific Grove 2011).

Development continued in the area with David Jacks, the original landowner of the subdivision, continuing with land improvements such as bridges over gulches, clearing avenues, and building fences and sites. In 1874—around the same time negotiations began for the formation of the Pacific Grove Retreat—David Jacks and Salinas landowner Carlisle S. Abbott organized the Monterey & Salinas Valley Railroad. This was an important step in the formation of the city. Development of the city continued for the next 45 years to transform from a religious retreat to a summer retreat to a city (Pacific Grove 2011).

In some respects, 1889 might be considered the watershed year of the period, as it marked the incorporation of the city and the arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad. Pacific Grove first began to develop with houses for year-round occupancy in the mid-1880s, and the city continued to grow through the turn of the century in a fairly steady arc with late Victorian architectural styles predominating. Starting in 1902, a dramatic redevelopment of the beach area at Lovers Point with expanded tourist facilities and the introduction of new architectural styles and building materials—particularly in commercial buildings—took place. The next major additions to the city were not made until 1905 and 1907, respectively (Pacific Grove 2011).

This growth period established the residential and commercial development patterns that would guide the city’s development through the mid-twentieth century. The overwhelming majority of surviving buildings from this period are residential, primarily consisting of single-family residences, with only a

handful of multi-family buildings. Residential architecture of the period encompasses a wide range of Victorian-era styles. Due to the city's start as a retreat, most residences are vernacular in nature and may loosely be grouped under the heading of Folk Victorian. Commercial properties, civic and public assembly properties, and cultural landscape elements associated with the significant themes of the "Early Development of Pacific Grove" period are also present. Although a handful of light industrial properties existed during this period, none appear to be extant today (Pacific Grove 2011).

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Pacific Grove contains a wealth of historic resources that are protected under federal, state, and local regulations. Historic Resources Committee, which is tasked with determination of additions and deletions from the historic resources inventory, Initial Historic Screenings of structures, and other duties as set out by Council, no direct impacts would occur to historic resources.

Indirect impacts resulting from implementation of projects approved under the condominium ordinance could take place. New development could impact historic resources through modifications of structures or vistas. Nonetheless, future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to determine impacts on cultural resources. More specifically, future development is required to conduct preconstruction surveys for historical resources and implement mitigation measures to ensure preservation of such resources. Further, subsequent projects would comply with federal, state, and local regulation as they pertain to cultural resources. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** CEQA requires lead agencies to consider whether projects would impact unique archaeological resources. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g) includes a definition of unique cultural resources and criteria for determining whether a resource meets that definition. Treatment options under Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a unique archaeological resource). Any future discretionary land use decisions and development projects in the city would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA and be subject to consideration under the goals, objectives, policies, and programs of the City's existing regulations, as is the case under existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** No human remains would be disturbed as a result of ordinance adoption, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. If human remains are encountered during any future projects in the city, the California Health and Safety Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) require that work in the immediate area must halt, the remains must be protected, and the county coroner must be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be notified (typically by the coroner) within 24 hours, as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097. The NAHC would identify and contact a most likely descendant, who would be given the opportunity to provide recommendations for the treatment of the remains within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Condominium Ordinance would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. The identification and protection of significant tribal cultural resources, and associated consultation with local Native American tribes, would continue to be governed by the CEQA process,

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Assembly Bill 52, and Senate Bill 18 where applicable. As noted previously, the condominium ordinance does not contemplate any specific development projects. Any future discretionary development projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) Pacific Grove is in a seismically active region and has experienced damage caused by ground shaking within the last 35 years. A number of faults traverse the county near the Monterey Peninsula, including the San Andreas fault, which runs north–south about 28 miles east of Pacific Grove. The San Andreas fault is considered capable of producing an earthquake with a magnitude of up to 8.5 on the Richter scale. The US Geological Survey in 1990 estimated that there is a 67 percent chance of a magnitude 7 or larger earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Area during the next 30 years with an epicenter somewhere between San Jose and Santa Rosa (Pacific Grove 1994b).

Two other active fault zones affecting Pacific Grove are the Monterey Bay and the Palo Colorado-San Gregorio fault zones. These two areas, both of which have experienced movement along individual fault segments, are separated by the submerged Monterey Canyon (Pacific Grove 1994b). Besides these three active faults, there are another 15 potentially active faults in Monterey County (Pacific Grove 1994b).

- i) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Adoption of the condominium ordinance would not cause a rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. The ordinance does not include any development projects. Any future projects would have to refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and comply with environmental review under CEQA, as under existing conditions. Adoption of the condominium ordinance would not result in the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
 - ii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a)i) above. The proposed condominium ordinance would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving strong seismic ground shaking. No development projects are proposed; thus, there would be no increase in potential for impacts due to seismic ground shaking. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
 - iii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a)i) above. The city is seismically active, but no projects are proposed in the condominium ordinance. Thus, there would be no increase in potential for impacts due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Future projects and discretionary land use decisions would be required to identify, evaluate, and mitigate for seismic hazards as part of the environmental review under CEQA, representing no change from existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.
 - iv) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a)i) above. The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not entail specific development projects. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions, and would be required to identify, evaluate, and mitigate for landslides as part of the CEQA process. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a)i) above. The condominium ordinance would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil since no projects are being implemented with the ordinance. The soils in the city have a moderate erosion hazard and a moderate runoff potential (Pacific Grove 1994b). Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a)i) above. The condominium ordinance does not propose any development projects that would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the projects, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. According to the City of Pacific Grove General Plan, the potential for liquefaction exists primarily in beach and sand dune areas and in

fill areas close to the shoreline. This potential is greatest in the Spanish Bay and Asilomar areas (Pacific Grove 1994a). Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance would not result in a project being located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). No projects are being implemented with adoption of the ordinance. Future projects or land use would have to consult Table 18-1-B and comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance would not result in soils being incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater, as no projects are being implemented. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with seismic codes and environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not propose any development projects. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. The ordinance would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

The CEQA Guidelines specifically allow lead agencies to determine thresholds of significance that illustrate the extent of an impact and are a basis from which to apply mitigation measures. This means that each agency is left to determine if a project’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would have a significant impact on the environment. The guidelines direct that agencies are to use “careful judgment” and “make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate” the development’s GHG emissions (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15064.4[a]). Determining a threshold of significance for climate change impacts poses a special difficulty for lead agencies. Much of the science in this area is new and is evolving constantly. The CEQA Amendments do not prescribe specific significance thresholds but instead leave considerable discretion to lead agencies to develop appropriate thresholds to apply to projects within their jurisdiction.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32 is a legal mandate requiring that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. In adopting AB 32, the legislature determined the necessary GHG reductions for the State to make to sufficiently offset its contribution to cumulative climate change to reach 1990 levels. AB 32 is the only legally mandated requirement for the reduction of GHGs. As such, compliance with AB 32 is the adopted basis on which the agency can base its significance threshold for evaluating GHG impacts.

a, b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would occur from ordinance adoption. Indirect impacts resulting from future development approved under the ordinance could cause increases in greenhouse gas emissions.

Construction Emissions

CEQA does not require an agency to evaluate an impact that is “too speculative,” provided that the agency identifies the impact, engages in a “thorough investigation” but is “unable to resolve an issue,” and then discloses its conclusion that the impact is too speculative for evaluation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15145, Office of Planning and Research Commentary). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15146(b), “An EIR on a project such as the adoption or amendment of a comprehensive zoning ordinance or a local general plan should focus on the secondary effects that can be expected to follow from the adoption or amendment, but the EIR need not be as detailed as an EIR on the specific construction projects that might follow.”

Construction of future development permitted by the condominium ordinance would result in GHG emissions from the use of construction equipment. However, details of these future construction activities are unknown at this time and therefore cannot be quantified.

Operational Impacts

Area sources include emissions from natural gas combustion, hearths (woodstoves and fireplaces), landscaping equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings. Indirect sources include emissions from energy consumption and water conveyance. Mobile sources include emissions from passenger vehicles and delivery trucks. Typically, mobile sources are the primary contributor of GHG emissions. However, most development would take place in an infill setting because of Pacific Grove's mostly developed nature.

Future development would undergo additional environmental review on a project-by-project basis to determine GHG contributions and compliance with all applicable regulations. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review and be subject to compliance with federal and state regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Many types of businesses use various chemicals and hazardous materials, and their routine business operations involve chemicals that are manufactured, warehoused, or transported. Currently, a variety of existing business operations in the city (commercial and industrial) use, store, or transport hazardous substances, as well as generate hazardous waste. The secondary activities that would occur with residential, commercial, and industrial uses (e.g., building and landscape maintenance) would also involve the use of hazardous materials. The proposed condominium ordinance would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as it does

not include any development project. The proposed ordinance would not change regulations and oversight related to hazardous materials. Further, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. Human exposure to a hazardous substance could occur through accidental release. Incidents that result in an accidental release of a hazardous substance into the environment can cause contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater, in addition to any toxic fumes that might be generated. If not cleaned up immediately and completely, the hazardous substances can migrate into the soil or enter a local stream or channel, causing contamination of soil and water. Human exposure to contaminated soil or water can have potential health effects from a variety of factors, including the nature of the contaminant and the degree of exposure.

The condominium ordinance does not propose any development projects. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. The ordinance does not have any components that would result in a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. The condominium ordinance does not have any components that would result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No development projects are proposed as part of the ordinance. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. The ordinance does not have any components that would result in projects to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. According to a Geotracker search (SWRCB 2015), there are no federal superfund sites located in Pacific Grove. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, it does not have any components that would result in a safety hazard in an airport land use area. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects and therefore would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects and therefore would not impair the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- h) **No Impact.** The City is not in an area identified as having a high potential for wildland fire (Cal Fire 2014). Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. The condominium ordinance would have no impact related to wildland fires.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Urban runoff and other non-point source discharges are regulated by the 1972 federal Clean Water Act, through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program established by the EPA. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, which include

construction activities. The SWRCB works in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality.

The SWRCB adopted NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Stormwater Runoff Associated With Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). Construction sites with 1.0 acre or greater of soil disturbance or less than 1.0 acre, but part of a greater common plan of development, are required to apply for coverage for discharges under the General Construction Permit by submitting a Notice of Intent for coverage, developing a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), and implement best management practices (BMPs) to address construction site pollutants. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities.

Construction activities from future development permitted under the condominium ordinance would be subject to compliance with all applicable standards as outlined above. Additionally, through the City's development review process, future development would be evaluated for potential water quality impacts from construction activities. As such, the condominium ordinance would not result in violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements in the city.

Regarding operational impacts, the Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). The RWQCBs have adopted NPDES stormwater permits for medium and large municipalities. Most of these permits are issued to a group of co-permittees encompassing an entire metropolitan area, in this case the [Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program](#). This permit regulates stormwater and urban runoff discharges from development to constructed and natural storm drain systems in Pacific Grove. Among other requirements, the NPDES permit specifies requirements for managing runoff water quality from new development and significant redevelopment projects, including specific sizing criteria for treatment BMPs. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City receives its water from the California American Water Company. The Monterey Peninsula is served by groundwater sources from the Santa Margarita, Paso Robles, and Carmel Alluvium aquifers as well as surface water from the Sand City Desalination Plant. The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District is the regulatory agency serving Pacific Grove.

The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. Future development would increase demand for groundwater but would generally consist of infill and redevelopment in areas that already urbanized and built up. Further, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. The ordinance has no components that would deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. The ordinance has no components that would alter existing drainage patterns in the city and thus would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. Pacific Grove is largely built and has existing stormwater infrastructure. Future development would largely be infill or redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply

with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response c) above. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. The ordinance does not have any components that would alter the existing drainage pattern in the city, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response c) above. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. It does not have any components that would contribute to stormwater runoff or drainage systems in the city. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above. Any impacts from the condominium ordinance would be less than significant.
- g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. It does not have any components that would result in placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The Forest Lake Reservoir, which is located within Pebble Beach is owned and operated by the Pebble Beach Community Services District. It is filled with recycled water during winter months when there is excess production at the Carmel Area Wastewater District's treatment plant to make it more resistant to storms and earthquake damage.

Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response g) above.
- i) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not contain any components that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of a failed levee or dam. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- j) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Analysis there are several areas in the City that are vulnerable to tsunami hazards. As shown in Figure 6 of the document coastal areas of the City are potentially vulnerable (Pacific Grove 2015). The ordinance does not include any development proposals, and future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Any impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects or land use decisions that would physically divide a community. Future development would be mostly infill and redevelopment. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Development in Pacific Grove is required to comply with several regional and local land use plans including air quality management plans, Association of Monterey Area Government Regional Plans, and the City's General Plan. The proposed condominium ordinance would not change or conflict with these plans. The proposed zoning ordinance would not supersede any other regulations or requirements adopted or imposed by the City of Pacific Grove, the State of California, or any federal agency that has jurisdiction by law over uses and development. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, as there are none in place in the city. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** There are no known mineral resources present in the city. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, adoption of the ordinance would have no impact.

- b) **No Impact.** There are no known mineral resources present in Pacific Grove. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

The City of Pacific Grove General Plan identifies an exterior noise standard of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for day-night average sound levels (L_{dn}) for residential land uses. For noise sources affecting residential districts, maximum noise levels may not exceed 70 dBA sound level equivalents (L_{eq}) during daylight hours (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and 65 dBA L_{eq} after sunset (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development would involve construction activities and operations, which would generate both short-term and long-term noise impacts. Short-term noise impacts could occur during grading and construction. Construction activities associated with future development are anticipated to temporarily exceed the City's noise standards. The degree of noise impact would be dependent on the distance between the construction activity and the noise-sensitive receptor. The short-term impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Long-term noise impacts would be associated with vehicular traffic to/from the site (including residents, visitors, and patrons), outdoor activities, and stationary mechanical equipment on-site. To determine long-term noise levels and project-related impacts, specific information is needed for a particular project. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure that noise standards are not exceeded. Future development would

be required to comply with City, state, and federal guidelines regarding vehicle noise, roadway construction, and noise abatement and insulation standards. This would ensure that noise levels in the city are maintained within acceptable standards that prevent extensive disturbance, annoyance, or disruption. Individual assessments of potential impacts from project-related noise sources may be required. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Given the project-by-project review and compliance with existing regulations, the condominium ordinance would have less than significant impacts on long-term noise.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development would involve construction activities and operations, which could expose people and structure to groundborne vibrations. Increases in groundborne vibration levels from individual projects would be primarily associated with short-term construction-related activities. Project construction would require the use of off-road equipment, such as haul trucks. Continuous vibrations in excess of 0.1 inches per second peak particle velocity (ppv) are identified by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as the minimum perceptible level for ground vibration, in terms of human annoyance. Short periods of ground vibration in excess of 0.2 inches per second can be expected to result in increased levels of annoyance to people within buildings (Caltrans 2002).

Additionally, buildings could be exposed to groundborne vibrations. Historic structures are particularly susceptible to groundborne vibration impacts. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure that groundborne vibrations would not impact people and structures. Future development would be required to comply with City, state, and federal guidelines regarding groundborne vibration standards. Individual assessments of potential impacts from project-related vibrations may be required. If necessary, mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Given the project-by-project review and compliance with existing regulations, less than significant impacts would result related to groundborne vibrations.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response a) above.
- e) **No Impact.** No private or public airports are located within the city limits. The nearest airport is Monterey Regional Airport, which is located approximately 6 miles southeast of the City. The City is not located within the projected noise contour zones of this airport. Adoption of the ordinance would have no impact.
- f) **No Impact.** See response e) above.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

Pacific Grove is located in Monterey County and has a population of approximately 15,552. The city has experienced minimal change in population over the past 30 years (the population was estimated at 15,683 as of 2010). Accordingly, the size and composition of the city’s housing stock has changed very little since 1990 with a net increase of less than 200 units. The city is nearly built out, with limited vacant land available for new housing development.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects, including roadway extensions or other infrastructure that may directly or indirectly induce growth. Future development could increase population in the city through the creation of new condominiums and opportunities for homeownership. The City’s Housing Element expects a 1 percent population growth and a 3 percent increase in multi-family housing units. Due to the limited availability of land in the city, future development would be mainly infill and redevelopment and would be accommodated in this expected growth.

Development would generally consist of infill and redevelopment served by existing roads and infrastructure. Adoption of the condominium ordinance would not require the extension of public infrastructure (i.e., any transportation facility or public utility) or the provision of new public services. The roads throughout the city are fully improved. Public utilities would be extended to future development from existing facilities. Public services are provided throughout the city, and the establishment of new sources of service would not be required. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would not induce indirect population growth in the city through the extension of roads or other infrastructure, or the provision of new services.

Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As of 2010, there were a total of 8,112 housing units in Pacific Grove. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. Given that the city is

primarily a built-out area, it is anticipated that future development would generally consist of infill and redevelopment. As such, the ordinance would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or persons. Additionally, future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response b) above.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** In December 2008, the Pacific Grove Fire Department merged with the Monterey City Fire Department, creating a 67-person, four-station department with enhanced operational capability and depth of resources to better provide a broad spectrum of services to both communities at a lower overall cost than maintaining two separate departments. Pacific Grove Station #4 protects a geographical area of 2.5 square miles with a full-time population of 15,500 residents. Station #4 responds to an average of 1,450 calls a year.

Future development would increase the demand for fire protection services in the city and may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. The environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be dependent on the location and nature of the proposed facilities and would undergo separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure potential impacts to fire protection services are minimized. Additionally, future development would be subject to compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations governing the provision of fire protection services (i.e., fire access, fire flows, and hydrants). The Monterey City Fire Department would impose standard conditions of approval, including recommending mitigation, which would ensure that individual project impacts on fire protection services are reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of General Plan strategies and actions, recommended mitigation, and approval of subsequent project-specific secured fire protection agreements would reduce impacts to fire protection services to a less than significant level.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Pacific Grove is served by the Pacific Grove Police Department with 21 officers and 9 support professionals. Future development would increase the demand for police protection services in the city and may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. The environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities would be dependent on the location and nature of the proposed facilities and would undergo separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure potential impacts to police protection services are minimized. Additionally, future development would

be subject to compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations governing the provision of police protection services. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review and be subject to compliance with General Plan strategies and actions, impacts involving police protection services would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Pacific Grove Unified School District serves the population of the city. The district serves a population of approximately 2,050 students in five schools: two elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one continuation school. The City of Pacific Grove is mostly built out and future development would be limited in scope. Although it is unlikely, future development permitted under the condominium ordinance has the potential to increase the city's student population and may require new school facilities and/or improvements to existing facilities. The degree of impacts to schools would be dependent on the size and location of the residential development and the existing condition of the school facilities serving the area. The environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities would be dependent on the location and nature of the proposed facilities and would undergo separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure potential impacts to school facilities are minimized. Pursuant to SB 50, payment of fees to the applicable school district is considered full mitigation for project impacts. Future development would also be subject to compliance with General Plan strategies, which would reduce impacts to school facilities to a less than significant level.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are 28 formally designated park, open space, and recreation facilities in Pacific Grove in addition to public school facilities used for recreation. Several other areas constitute important open space resources but are not available for traditional park and recreation use. General Plan Chapter 5, Parks and Recreation, outlines the existing parks and recreation facilities as well as goals and policies for preservation of green space in the city. The condominium ordinance does not propose any development projects and would have no direct impact on parks. Although unlikely due to the limited nature of available space in the City, future development could increase the demand for parkland and recreational facilities and usage of existing facilities, such that deterioration of these facilities could be accelerated. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. As such, any impacts that would occur would be less than significant.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response d) in subsection 14, Public Services.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response d) in subsection 14, Public Services.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

The city’s roadway network consists of a street system that is laid out in a basic grid pattern. Variations to the grid occur due to topography and in those areas developed with the more contemporary subdivision pattern of cul-de-sac and closed loop local streets tying into collector streets. A wide range of street widths are represented from the 30-foot rights-of-way to 100 feet on Pine Avenue. The standard width for new streets is a 50-foot-wide right-of-way according to the City of Pacific Grove General Plan (1994a). Traffic volumes are generally lower on weekends than weekdays except for streets accessing visitor attractions including Ocean View Boulevard, Central Avenue, Asilomar Avenue, and Sunset Drive. The streets generally accommodate traffic within their design capacity (Pacific Grove 1994a). However, portions of Central, Forest, David, and Congress avenues and on weekends, Ocean View Boulevard, are at or near their design capacity. Some problem areas include congestion in the vicinity near the Monterey Bay Aquarium, through traffic on Patterson Lane to access State Route 68, and through traffic to and from Monterey accessing SR 68 via Prescott Lane.

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The existing arterials that serve Pacific Grove are described in the City's General Plan Transportation Element including respective level of service (LOS) and road capacity. LOS is commonly used as a qualitative description of roadway operation and is based on the capacity of the roadway segment and the volume of traffic using the roadway segment. The City's General Plan found that most roadways in the city function at acceptable LOS levels.

The condominium ordinance does not include any development proposals and as such would not conflict any applicable plans regarding transportation systems. Future development would increase vehicular movement in the vicinity of each future development site during AM and PM peak-hour periods. Given that the city is primarily a built-out area, it is anticipated that future development would generally consist of infill and redevelopment. As a result, the transportation infrastructure is largely already available to these areas. Impacts would result from the incremental traffic generation of redevelopment activities and new uses on vacant parcels. Depending on the specific site locations, intensity of development, and trip distribution characteristics, future increases in traffic volumes could aggravate existing deficiencies and/or cause a roadway segment to operate at an unacceptable level of service. Nonetheless, the General Plan anticipates such growth and potential impacts to LOS.

Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure potential impacts to the city's transportation system are minimized. Due to the conceptual nature of future development, proposals would require individual assessments of potential impacts to traffic and transportation. If necessary, mitigation would be recommended to avoid or lessen potential impacts at the site-specific level. Future development would also be subject to compliance with General Plan strategies and actions. Given that future development would undergo project-by-project review and be subject to compliance with General Plan strategies and actions, traffic/circulation impacts would be less than significant.

Refer to response f) below for a discussion regarding potential impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is the Congestion Management Agency for the County of Monterey, including the City of Pacific Grove. As discussed above, the condominium ordinance does not include any specific development proposals. Any future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure compliance with congestion management plans. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c) **No Impact.** The city is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed condominium ordinance would have no impact on air traffic patterns.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The condominium ordinance does not include development projects, and no components would increase any hazards due to a design feature. Any future discretionary development would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** All future development would be required to meet all applicable local and state regulatory standards for adequate emergency access; refer also to response g) below. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would have a less than significant impact.

- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Monterey-Salinas Transit Agency serves Pacific Grove. Currently, two bus routes and trolley routes serve the city. The city has an extensive system of bike and pedestrian trails. The condominium ordinance does not have any components that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit. The city is primarily a built-out area, and future development would generally consist of infill and redevelopment. As such, it is not anticipated that any incremental growth in transit trips produced by future development would generate a demand beyond the capacity already provided. Additionally, it is not anticipated that future development would impact the effectiveness of the city's bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure potential impacts to the city's transportation system are minimized. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Pacific Grove provides sewer services for residents and commercial businesses. The City owns and operates the sewer collection system consisting of approximately 58 miles of pipeline (with pipes varying in size from 4 to 18 inches in diameter), 900 manholes, and 7 pump stations. Wastewater collected in the city is conveyed to the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) Regional Treatment Plant in Marina by an interceptor pipeline located along the coast through the cities of Monterey, Seaside, and Marina. The Regional Treatment Plant treats and recycles approximately 60 percent of wastewater collected in the MRWPCA service area for reuse by the agricultural industry in northern Monterey County. The remaining 40 percent of treated wastewater is discharged into the Monterey Bay. The condominium ordinance does not have any components that would result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Future development would undergo environmental and design review on a project-by-project basis in order to ensure future development would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Future development would continue to comply with all wastewater treatment provisions, as enforced by the RWQCB. Impacts to wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Pacific Grove receives water services from the California American Water Company and as mentioned above, wastewater services from the MRWPCA. The City of Pacific Grove is currently experiencing a water shortage and is maintaining a waiting list for new water meter connections.

The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development would increase water consumption, placing greater demands on water conveyance and wastewater facilities. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to response d) below.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District regulates potable water in the Monterey Peninsula along with local governments. Effective August 1, 1995, all remaining water allocated to the City of Pacific Grove by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, and all water becoming available after that date will be allocated, in amounts and percentages determined by the City Council, to four allocation categories, residential, commercial, government and community reserve. Building permit applications for projects for which there is no available water will not be accepted or processed. However, the Municipal Code establishes a prioritized waiting list for each allocation category. Projects are placed on a waiting list according to order of receipt of proof of readiness to apply for a building permit.

The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development would increase water demands. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response d) above.

- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Monterey Regional Waste Management District manages solid waste from the Monterey Peninsula region. The district's role includes the recovery of recyclable materials including cardboard, glass, wood, yard waste, plastics, metal, sheetrock, concrete, asphalt, reusable building materials, and resale items. The condominium ordinance does not include any development projects; therefore, no direct impacts would occur from adoption of the ordinance. Future development would increase solid waste disposal needs. Future projects or land use decisions would be required to comply with environmental review under CEQA, as is the case under existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response f) above.

4.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As concluded in the Biological Resources and Cultural Resources subsections, the proposed condominium ordinance would result in less than significant impacts on biological resources and cultural resources (i.e., historic, archaeological, or paleontological). Therefore, the ordinance would result in less than significant impacts involving the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant as demonstrated by the responses.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As demonstrated in this Initial Study, the condominium ordinance would not result in any direct or indirect significant impacts. The ordinance does not include any specific development projects, land use or zoning changes, or other changes to the way the City processes development projects. Future projects would also be subject to CEQA review. Therefore, the condominium ordinance would not result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Previous sections of this Initial Study reviewed the condominium ordinance's potential impacts involving aesthetics, air pollution, noise, public health and safety, traffic, and other issues. As concluded in these previous discussions, the ordinance would not result in any significant impacts related to these issues. Therefore, the C-1-T Zone Condominium Ordinance would not result in environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

This page intentionally left blank

5.0 REFERENCES

5.0 REFERENCES

- Cal Fire (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2014. http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones.php. Accessed September 10, 2014.
- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2002. *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations*.
- . 2013. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Accessed October 22, 2013. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm.
- DTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2015a. DTSC website. Accessed September 10, 2015. <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/>.
- . 2015b. EnviroStor. Accessed September 10, 2015. <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/>.
- EPA (US Environmental Protection Agency). 2015. Laws and Regulations. Accessed May 1, 2015. <http://www.epa.gov/lawsregs/index.html>.
- Goudey, Charles B., and Scott R. Miles. 1998. *Ecological Subregions of California: Section & Subsection Descriptions*. Major contributions by Earl B. Alexander and John O. Sawyer. USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.
- McNab, W. H., D. T. Cleland, J. A. Freeouf, J. E. Keys, Jr., G. J. Nowacki, and C. A. Carpenter, comps. 2007. *Description of ecological subregions: sections of the conterminous United States*. General Technical Report WO-76B. Washington, DC: USDA, Forest Service.
- Pacific Grove, City of. 1989. *Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan*. <http://www.ci.pg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=104>.
- . 1994a. *City of Pacific Grove General Plan*. Adopted October 1994. <http://www.ci.pg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=96>.
- . 1994b. *City of Pacific Grove General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. Adopted October 1994.
- . 2011. *City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement*.
- . 2015. Demographics. Accessed September 10, 2015. <http://www.ci.pg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=362>.
- . 2015. *City of Pacific Climate Change and Vulnerability Assessment*.
- SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2015. GeoTracker. Accessed September 10, 2015. <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- USDA (US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service). 2015. Web Soil Survey. <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>.

This page intentionally left blank