

to cumulative enrollment increases at CUSD elementary and middle schools which would exceed remaining existing capacity.

These impacts are considered less-than-significant, however, since school districts are authorized by State law to levy school impact fees on all new development to fund construction of classrooms or installation of portable classrooms.

#### **10. Wastewater**

Because existing wastewater treatment facilities in the Monterey Peninsula area have ample capacity to accommodate demand generated from development in the Cal-Am area under all five water supply options and from cumulative growth districtwide, wastewater impacts would be less-than-significant.

#### **11. Housing**

The only potential housing-related impact resulting from any of the supply options would be the constraint on housing construction which would result from Supply Options I and IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and from Supply Option V at both production/consumption levels. For the purposes of CEQA, however, social and economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

#### **12. Employment**

The only potential employment-related impact resulting from any of the supply options would be the constraint on employment growth under Supply Options I and IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and from Supply Option V at both production/consumption levels. For CEQA purposes, however, social and economic effects are not considered significant environmental impacts. Employment in the construction industry is addressed separately in the following section.

#### **13. Construction Industry**

Supply Options I and IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and Supply Option V at both production/consumption levels would have significant adverse impacts on the construction industry by limiting the availability of new water supplies, thus limiting new residential and commercial construction. This would lead to a reduction in construction-related income and employment.

Because of the nature of the construction industry, no mitigation measures are available to reduce the local economic impacts of the loss of employment. Construction businesses and workers affected by the decline of new construction work would probably move to jobs in other areas. For the purposes of CEQA, however, economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

#### **14. Tourism**

The water supply options could have an effect on tourism through reductions in recreational opportunities and aesthetic qualities resulting from some of the supply options. Effects on future levels of tourism could also be affected by the amount of additional hotel development allowed. Under Options I and IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and Supply Option V at both production/consumption levels, no new hotel development would occur. This could represent a lost opportunity to keep pace with tourist demand.

For purposes of CEQA, socioeconomic effects, such as those related to tourism, are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

#### **15. Military**

None of the supply options would adversely affect military facilities on the Peninsula.

#### **16. Fiscal**

The potential fiscal impacts of the supply options on the eight jurisdictions are a result of the types of land uses which would be developed under each jurisdiction's general plan. For the purposes of CEQA, economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

#### **17. Air Quality**

Increases in regional pollutant emissions from growth that would occur under Supply Options II and III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and at Supply Options I, II, III, and IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B are expected to worsen air quality on the Monterey Peninsula and contribute to the cumulative impacts of increased air pollutant emissions within the region. Since the North Central Coast Air Basin is currently classified as in nonattainment of federal air quality standards for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> (particulates), and because no monitoring of carbon monoxide is currently conducted within the district, increased air pollution emissions are considered to be significant impacts.

Planned emission control measures identified in the 1989 *Air Quality Management Plan* and traffic mitigation measures identified in the previous section on traffic would reduce air pollutant emissions. Without detailed air quality modeling, however, it is unknown whether these measures would reduce the air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Table 2 summarizes the impacts of the five water supply options *without* mitigation measures applied. The impacts are classified as:

- S - Significant Adverse Impact
- P - Potentially Significant Impact
- L - Less than Significant Impact
- N - No Environmental Impact
- U - Unknown Impact

Table 3 summarizes the impacts of the five water supply options *with* mitigation measures applied.

In both tables the cells containing an S (Significant Adverse Impact) or P (Potentially Significant Impact) are highlighted.

**TABLE 2**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY**  
**WATER SUPPLY OPTIONS**  
**(Without Mitigation Measures)**

Impact Category	Baseline Production Level*	Supply Option I	Supply Option II	Supply Option III	Supply Option IV	Supply Option V
Surface Water Resources		L	L	L	L	L
Seaside Coastal Subbasin		L	P	P	L	L
Carmel Valley Aquifer		L	L	L	L	L
Lagoon Hydrology		L	P	P	L	L
Non-Cal-Am Groundwater Users		L	P	P	L	L
Water Quality		L	P	P	L	L
Riparian Vegetation:	AQ1	L	L	L	L	L
	AQ2					
	AQ3					
	AQ4					
Lagoon Vegetation		P	P	P	P	P
Upland Vegetation		U	U	U	U	L
Riparian Wildlife						
Lagoon Wildlife		P	P	P	P	P
Upland Wildlife		U	U	U	U	L
Special-Status Wildlife						
Fisheries						
Recreation		N	N	N	N	N
Aesthetics						
Shortfall Frequency/Magnitude		N	N	N	N	N
Level of Risk/Uncertainty		N	N	N	N	N
Frequency of New Meter Limitations		N	N	N	N	N
Level of Rationing Hardship		N	N	N	N	N
Traffic	A	N			N	N
	B					N
Schools	A	N	L	L	N	N
	B	L	L	L	L	N
Wastewater	A	N	L	L	N	N
	B	L	L	L	L	N
Housing	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Employment	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Construction Industry	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Tourism	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Military	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Fiscal Impacts	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Air Quality	A	N			N	N
	B					N

\*A = Baseline Production Level A (18,400 acre-feet)

B = Baseline Production Level B (16,700 acre-feet)

S = Significant Adverse Impact

P = Potentially Significant Impact

L = Less Than Significant Impact

N = No Environmental Impact

U = Unknown Impact

**TABLE 3**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY**  
**WATER SUPPLY OPTIONS**  
**(With Full Mitigation Measures)**

Impact Category	Baseline Production Level*	Supply Option I	Supply Option II	Supply Option III	Supply Option IV	Supply Option V
Surface Water Resources		L	L	L	L	L
Seaside Coastal Subbasin		L	L	L	L	L
Carmel Valley Aquifer		L	L	L	L	L
Lagoon Hydrology		L	P	P	L	L
Non-Cal-Am Groundwater Users		L	P	P	L	L
Water Quality		L	P	P	L	L
Riparian Vegetation:		L	L	L	L	L
AQ1		P	P	P	P	P
AQ2		P	P	P	P	P
AQ3		P	P	P	P	P
AQ4		P	P	P	P	P
Lagoon Vegetation		P	P	P	P	P
Upland Vegetation		U	U	U	U	L
Riparian Wildlife		P	P	P	P	P
Lagoon Wildlife		P	P	P	P	P
Upland Wildlife		U	U	U	U	L
Special-Status Wildlife		P	P	P	P	P
Fisheries		P	P	P	L	L
Recreation		N	N	N	N	N
Aesthetics		P	P	P	P	P
Shortfall Frequency/Magnitude		N	N	N	N	N
Level of Risk/Uncertainty		N	N	N	N	N
Frequency of New Meter Limitations		N	N	N	N	N
Level of Rationing Hardship		N	N	N	N	N
Traffic	A	N	L	L	N	N
	B	U	U	U	U	N
Schools	A	N	L	L	N	N
	B	L	L	L	L	N
Wastewater	A	N	L	L	N	N
	B	L	L	L	L	N
Housing	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Employment	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Construction Industry	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Tourism	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Military	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Fiscal Impacts	A	N	N	N	N	N
	B	N	N	N	N	N
Air Quality	A	N	U	U	N	N
	B	U	U	U	U	N

\*A=Baseline Production Level A (18,400 acre-feet)

B=Baseline Production Level B (16,700 acre-feet)

S = Significant Adverse Impact

P = Potentially Significant Impact

L = Less Than Significant Impact

N = No Environmental Impact

U = Unknown Impact

## **E. SUMMARY OF WATER DISTRIBUTION IMPACTS**

The following paragraphs summarize the impacts of the water distribution alternatives, focusing on those impacts deemed to be either significant or potentially significant. Mitigation measures identified to reduce or eliminate the significant or potentially significant impacts are also summarized.

As described previously, there are 26 possible combinations of supply options, distribution alternatives, and assumed baseline production/consumption levels that would provide discrete and quantifiable amounts of additional Cal-Am water to the eight affected jurisdictions. Because analysis of the 26 scenarios for each jurisdiction would be unmanageable, this analysis is generally based on the scenario which would result in the most water available for new development for each jurisdiction.

Because Distribution Alternative I (No Allocation) would result in no discrete jurisdictional allotments, it is not possible to accurately characterize where development might occur within the district boundaries, and thus, what effects that development might have. Therefore, Distribution Alternative I is not analyzed in this EIR.

The analysis focuses particularly on Distribution Alternatives II through VI at Supply Option III (20,500 acre-feet) at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B (16,700 acre-feet), since this scenario provides the most water for new development.

### **1. Water Resources**

The impacts of any of the distribution alternatives on the Carmel Valley Aquifer, the Seaside Coastal Subbasin, and the Carmel River are considered less-than-significant.

### **2. Vegetation**

Without more specific information as to where growth would occur in the affected jurisdictions, the significance of any impacts on vegetation cannot be determined. Additional environmental review, as required by CEQA, would be necessary when the location of new development is determined by the responsible jurisdictions.

### **3. Wildlife**

Without more specific information as to where growth would occur in the affected jurisdictions, the significance of any impacts on wildlife cannot be determined. Additional environmental review, as required by CEQA, would be necessary when the location of new development is determined by the responsible jurisdictions.

### **4. Recreation**

Recreation would not be affected by the distribution alternatives, except indirectly through growth creating additional demands on existing recreational facilities. The impacts of any of the five distribution alternatives are considered less-than-significant.

## 5. Land Use

None of the distribution alternatives being analyzed would alter planned land uses. However, the amount of new development that could occur in each jurisdiction would vary depending on the amount of water it received under each of the distribution alternatives. It is assumed that any new development that would be allowed by additional water is a beneficial impact. For purposes of CEQA, the land use impacts of any of the five distribution alternatives are considered less-than-significant.

## 6. Housing and Population Growth

None of the distribution alternatives being analyzed would alter planned residential land uses. The amount of new housing development and related increases in population that could occur in each jurisdiction would vary depending on the amount of water it received under each of the distribution alternatives. It is assumed that any new housing development that would be allowed by additional water would have a beneficial effect on the housing market. On the other hand, constraints on the development of new housing could be interpreted as a negative impact on the housing market because of the effect that such constraints might have on the affordability of housing.

For the purposes of CEQA, however, social and economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

## 7. Traffic

All the distribution alternatives being analyzed would provide for additional growth in Monterey Peninsula area jurisdictions, and would contribute to some degree to the deteriorating levels of service on area freeways. These impacts are considered significant whether a jurisdiction's contribution to regional traffic deterioration is large or small, because all of the freeway segments analyzed in the EIR are currently operating at an unacceptable level of service, as defined by Monterey County.

Street and highway projects have been identified by the Monterey County Transportation Commission (MCTC) and the California Department of Transportation to improve freeway conditions in the Monterey Peninsula region.

A number of additional regional measures are available to reduce traffic volumes in the Monterey Peninsula area, including the following:

- Implement the Monterey-Salinas Short-Term Transit Plan, including:
  - maintaining existing levels of service,
  - adding evening bus service,
  - expanding service to new areas to serve new development and presently unserved areas,
  - adding new service for visitor transportation on the Monterey Peninsula and in the unincorporated areas of the county where major visitor events are held,
  - adding to the existing bus fleet,
  - constructing transit centers and park-and-ride lots, and
  - improving passenger information at bus stops.
- Develop a Long-Range Transit Program that includes provisions for:
  - an intercity bus service connecting south county and Salinas;

- initiation of subscription bus service for large employers, hotels and motels, special events and major trip attractors; and
- initiation of service to newly developing areas in Monterey County.
- Implement an intracity and intercity bicycle program as described in the Monterey Regional Transportation Plan (Monterey County Transportation Commission 1988).
- Implement transportation control measures as outlined in the 1989 *Air Quality Management Plan* for the Monterey region.

Funding of these street and highway projects or transit improvements, however, cannot be assumed. The MPWMD does not have the authority to fund or authorize any of these freeway or transit improvements.

While these mitigation measures would improve traffic conditions, it is unknown whether they would reduce the traffic impacts of the distribution alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

### **8. Schools**

While increased enrollments at several schools would exceed existing remaining capacity under the various distribution alternatives, these impacts are considered less-than-significant, since school districts are authorized by State law to levy school impact fees on new development to fund the construction of classrooms or installation of portable classrooms.

### **9. Wastewater**

The wastewater flows from new development under the five distribution alternatives could be adequately handled by existing treatment facilities. Therefore, wastewater impacts are considered less-than-significant.

### **10. Employment**

The amount of new employment-generating development that could occur in each jurisdiction would vary depending on the amount of water it received under each of the distribution alternatives. It is assumed that any new employment-generating development that would be allowed by additional water is a beneficial impact. For the purposes of CEQA, however, economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

### **11. Construction Industry**

The amount of construction activity that could occur in each jurisdiction would vary depending on the amount of water it received under each of the distribution alternatives. Because Alternatives II through V would allow for similar levels of construction within the district, albeit at levels lower than an unconstrained market would support, and because construction workers could commute to job sites wherever they are located within the district, the impacts of any of these alternatives on the construction industry in any one jurisdiction is considered less-than-significant. Adoption of Alternative VI would result in an unavoidable significant impact on the local construction industry because it would substantially reduce overall construction levels within the district. For the purposes of CEQA, however, economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.



## **12. Tourism**

The amount of new hotel development that could occur in each jurisdiction would vary depending on the amount of water it received under each of the distribution alternatives. It is assumed that any new hotel development that would be allowed by additional water would have a beneficial impact on tourism. Under several of the distribution alternatives, some communities would have no additional water to support new hotel development. However, this would have no impact on existing levels of tourism in these communities. For the purposes of CEQA, however, social and economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

## **13. Military**

None of the five water distribution alternatives being analyzed is expected to have an impact on military facilities.

## **14. Fiscal**

Implementation of the distribution alternatives may result in adverse fiscal effects for four jurisdictions, including Del Rey Oaks under Alternatives III through VI, Pacific Grove under Alternatives II through V, Monterey County under all alternatives, and Carmel-by-the-Sea under Alternative VI. These potentially adverse impacts could be offset, to some extent, by adjustment of fees and developer funding requirements by the affected jurisdictions. For the purposes of CEQA, however, economic effects are not considered to have significant environmental impacts.

## **15. Air Quality**

Since the North Central Coast Air Basin is currently a nonattainment area for ozone, and because ozone modeling has not yet been performed to determine whether future improvements are likely, ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions associated with the distribution alternatives are assumed to have significant air quality impacts.

Currently, no monitoring is conducted for CO in the air basin. But based on continued decreases in LOS, CO ambient standards may be violated within the area. Therefore, traffic-related increases in CO concentrations represent a significant impact.

The NCCAB is currently in nonattainment of federal standards for PM<sub>10</sub>. In addition, future emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> in the NCCAB are expected to increase (Figure V-2). Because vehicles are a primary source of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions and entrained road dust (MBUAPCD and AMBAG 1989), each of the water supply alternatives is assumed to have a significant impact on PM<sub>10</sub> air quality.

Planned emission control measures, including transportation control measures identified in the 1989 *Air Quality Management Plan*, should be implemented to reduce the air quality impacts of the distribution alternatives. In addition, the traffic mitigation measures identified in the previous section on traffic could reduce air pollutant emissions. Without detailed air quality modeling, however, it is unknown whether these measures would reduce the air quality impacts of the distribution alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

For each of the eight jurisdictions, Table 4 summarizes the impacts of Distribution Alternatives II through VI (Supply Option III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B) *without* mitigation measures applied. The impacts are classified as:

- S - Significant Adverse Impact
- P - Potentially Significant Impact
- L - Less than Significant Impact
- N - No Environmental Impact
- U - Unknown Impact

For each of the eight jurisdictions, Table 5 summarizes the impacts of Distribution Alternatives II through VI (Supply Option III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B) *with* mitigation measures applied.

In both tables the cells containing an S (Significant Adverse Impact) or P (Potentially Significant Impact) are highlighted.

TABLE 4

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY  
 WATER DISTRIBUTION ALTERNATIVES  
 (Without Mitigation Measures)

Impact Category	Carmel-by the-Sea	Del Rey Oaks	City of Monterey	Pacific Grove	Sand City	Seaside	Monterey County	MPAD
Water Resources	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Vegetation	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Wildlife	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Recreation	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Land Use	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Housing and Pop.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Traffic	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Schools	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Wastewater	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Employment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Construction Industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Tourism	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Military	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Fiscal Impacts	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Air Quality	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S

Note: Impacts indicated are for Supply Option III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B

- S = Significant Adverse Impact
- P = Potentially Significant Impact
- L = Less Than Significant Impact
- N = No Environmental Impact
- U = Unknown Impact

TABLE 5

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY  
 WATER DISTRIBUTION ALTERNATIVES  
 (With Mitigation Measures)

Impact Category	Carmel-by the-Sea	Del Rey Oaks	City of Monterey	Pacific Grove	Sand City	Seaside	Monterey County	MPAD
Water Resources	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Vegetation	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Wildlife	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Recreation	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Land Use	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Housing and Pop.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Traffic	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Schools	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Wastewater	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Employment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Construction Industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Tourism	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Military	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Fiscal Impacts	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Air Quality	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U

Note: Impacts indicated are for Supply Option III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B

- S = Significant Adverse Impact
- P = Potentially Significant Impact
- L = Less Than Significant Impact
- N = No Environmental Impact
- U = Unknown Impact

## **F. IMPACTS OF MONITORING/COMPLIANCE MECHANISMS AND ALLOCATION/CONSERVATION OF NEW WATER SUPPLIES**

### **1. Monitoring/Compliance Mechanisms**

This EIR evaluates existing and alternative mechanisms for District administration of its Water Allocation Program. These mechanisms include fixed-year versus rolling year monitoring and compliance determinations, fixed formula versus discretionary action, and grace water provisions. As changes to the District's administrative procedures, none of the alternatives would have significant environmental effects for CEQA purposes.

### **2. Allocation/Conservation of New Water Supplies**

The EIR assesses the impacts of various alternatives for how water saved through conservation, new water freed-up for use by reclamation projects, or potable water made available through new supplies should be treated in the context of the District's Allocation Program.

Generally, if the additional water made available through any of these methods were allowed to be used to support new development or intensification of existing uses, there would be potentially significant impacts. These impacts would vary depending on the amount of additional water available, on where the additional water was used, and which types of projects were developed with the water. On one hand, the additional water would allow for the expansion of the affected jurisdiction's and the area's housing stock and employment base and provide for the maintenance of the area's irrigated landscape. On the other hand, this additional development could have significant impacts on the roadway system as well as on other public facilities and increase the area's vulnerability to drought conditions.

Reserving some or all of the additional water made available through any of these methods as environmental/drought reserve in the form of reduced production would lessen drought vulnerability, leave more water for the protection of environmental values, and minimize development-related impacts.

In the case of reclamation projects and new potable water supply projects, the impacts of rededication to new development and/or conservation of the additional water would be subject to separate CEQA review.

## **G. MANDATORY CEQA SECTIONS**

### **1. Short-Term Versus Long-Term Uses**

The project described and analyzed in this EIR is not a single proposed action, but a set of water supply capacity options, water distribution alternatives, and alternative procedures for administration of the District's Allocation Program and the allocation and/or conservation of new water supplies. The impacts of these various options and alternatives vary dramatically. Supply Options I, IV, and V would allow no additional water to be produced by the Cal-Am system from the Monterey Peninsula Water Resource System. Both Supply Options II and III would allow for additional Cal-Am production. This water could in turn be used to support new development on the Monterey Peninsula.

Even with implementation of identified mitigation measures, some or all of the supply options will have significant impacts on Lagoon hydrology, non-Cal-Am groundwater users, water quality, riparian vegetation, Lagoon vegetation, fisheries, and aesthetics.

Increased Cal-Am production could also lead to increased development on the Monterey Peninsula. New development would be a permanent commitment of land to urban uses and would eliminate some existing natural vegetation.

## **2. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

As noted above, increased Cal-Am production under Supply Options I, II, and III could have a long-term adverse impacts on the steelhead population in the Carmel River. This impact would be considered irreversible.

## **3. Growth-Inducing Impacts**

Increased Cal-Am production under Supply Options II and III at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and under Supply Options I through IV at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B and the distribution of this water to the eight affected jurisdictions under all six distribution alternatives could lead to increased development on the Monterey Peninsula. This new development could include economic, residential, and population growth.

Supply Options I, IV, and V at Baseline Production/Consumption Level A and Supply Option V at Baseline Production/Consumption Level B would not in themselves provide additional water for new development, but, to the extent that water savings in existing development could be achieved and these savings were rededicated to new development, Supply Option I would also lead to increased development on the Monterey Peninsula.

Ultimately, new development is also subject to regulation by the individual jurisdictions consistent with their adopted general plans and land use policies.