

Comment Letter 10

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Ferrini Ranch Subdivision:

reference: Ferrini Ranch Subdivision (PLN040758;SCH#2005091055) Draft Environmental Impact Report

by Connectivity for Wildlife: tanyad@cfwildlife.com

10/24/2012



1. It has been proven through a wildlife corridor study conducted by Connectivity for Wildlife for the Big Sur Land Trust **that the habitat spanning along Highway 68 from Marks Ranch and Toro Park to the El Toro Hwy 68 underpass is a wildlife corridor for multiple species movement between Fort Ord, Marks Ranch, and Toro County Park (Northern Monterey Linkage Study: Diamond et al 2010).**

a) Due to the present human development and habitat fragmentation, this linkage is one of the few areas left to connect Northern Monterey to the Sierra de Salinas (Thorne et al 2002).

b) **The Guide to Wildlands Conservation in the Central Coast Region of California report (2002) states** the habitat between Marks Ranch and Fort Ord is critical mountain lion corridor. The data collected for the Northern Monterey Linkage Study on mountain lion movement verified his corridor modeling done in the 2002 paper. Jim Thorne's analysis also shows that the entire span of habitat between Fort Ord to Marks Ranch from Hwy 68 to Toro Peak from San Benancio Road to River Road is a critical mountain lion corridor (A Guide to Wildlands Conservation in the Central Coast Region of California (Thorne et al 2002).

c) This is a critical connection to ensure genetic flow will occur for many species. Severing this linkage would cause genetic isolation for many species in Northern Monterey (Thorne et al 2002, Diamond et al 2010).

d. **Draft 2010 Monterey County General Plan:** states that the habitat from Fort Ord- El Toro Creek to Toro Park to the Salinas River is designated as Linkage 375 Highway 68- El Toro Creek Corridor. Policy 3.1 states any potential development would require the preservation of portions of large unsubdivided properties between San Benancio Road and River Road be maintained to extant wildlife movement opportunities, see page 4.

2. The Wildlife Conservation Board gave significant funding to protecting this linkage from Fort Ord to Marks Ranch by providing funding for Marks Ranch as the Northern Monterey Linkage Study proved it was wildlife corridor for mountain lions.

3. It is critical to ensure this linkage for mountain lions is preserved as it had been found through a UC Davis study that mountain lions in the Central Coast already lack two genes from mountain lions in the rest of the state of California (Ernest et al 2003). Further fragmentation due to the proposed

10-1

Comment Letter 10 Continued

development would increase the genetic isolation and gene flow of mountain lions in Northern Monterey.

4. The area from the Hwy 68 El Toro Creek underpass to Marks Ranch is a corridor for North American Badger, a Species of Special Concern. As part of her Master thesis and the current Species of Special Concern Report, in prep, T. Diamond conducted a corridor analysis which included road kill data that showed the entire area of the proposed development spanning from Fort Ord to Marks Ranch is a critical habitat and corridor for badgers. Discussion of badger habitat, corridor analysis and maps were included in the Northern Monterey Linkage Study report. The DEIR stated that the mitigation for wildlife corridors was consistent with the Northern Monterey Linkage report, which is false. Mitigation for loss of badger habitat and corridors was not included.

a. The proposed development did not mitigate or adjust development plan scenarios to prevent severing the mountain lion and badger corridor that has been proven by 2 studies to exist from Fort Ord to Marks Ranch except for reduced housing around the El Toro Creek underpass which is not adequate as the corridor would be cut off by the proposed housing along Hwy 68 from housing units ranging from 72-135 by Toro Park.

b. Question 1: How does the DEIR propose to mitigate cutting off the mountain lion and Northern American badger corridor and loss of critical badger habitat from Toro Park to Marks Ranch as the setbacks are not enough space to allow for mountain lion and badger movement? See comments 5 and 6 for discussion on necessary corridor widths and setbacks page 2-3.

5. The DEIR states there is little research or data on optimal widths for wildlife corridors, see below, which **is false**. To maintain a functional wildlife corridor, it has been noted by several expert corridor biologists, that a wildlife corridor **must be 2km wide** (Penrod 2006, Bay Area Critical Linkages Report in prep). Since many corridors include bottlenecks due to freeways, such as Hwy 68, losing habitat can endanger the functionality of the wildlife corridor for animals being able to move through.

a. North American Badgers need **at least 1.8km wide** corridors as they are considered corridor dwellers and also need to be able to reside within the corridor(Penrod 2006, Northern Monterey Linkage report 2010, Diamond in prep)

Within open areas, corridor width may be larger to accommodate random movements associated with the search for cover or food. **There is little research or data on optimal widths for wildlife corridors** and larger species can move relatively quickly through narrow corridors whereas smaller species may need additional cover for multiple day movements.

6. Setbacks: A set back must be as large as possible to ensure functionality of the linkage. The presence of light and dogs detour animals from moving through the linkage. The set back must also include low lighting, wildlife friendly fencing, and the absence of back yard dogs. **A width of 300-400 feet is not sufficient based on scientific findings for the required width needed for wildlife corridors (Penrod 2006).**

10-1
cont'd

Comment Letter 10 Continued

wide) between lot groupings in the 30s and 40s. A width of 300-400 feet is sufficient given the focal point of this undercrossing. This will provide both protected movement corridors and

a. Since this is a known wildlife corridor for apex predators such as mountain lions, the proposed development being this high density would directly result in human-wildlife conflicts by developing within a known wildlife corridor (Urban Carnivores 2010).

7. Question 2: Will the increase of human housing & density increase traffic volume result in Caltrans needing to widen the highway? Their memo already notes, the traffic volume on Hwy 68 presents a formidable barrier. Traffic increase from development would have to be mitigated (Page 1 Technical Memorandum by Michael Josselyn 12/8/2010, see below).

In particular, Highway 68 and the Toro Park Estates development are a major barrier for wildlife species attempting to travel east and west through the Project Area. As of 2007, it carried about 26,000 vehicles per day. This level of traffic presents a formidable barrier to wildlife movement. Adjacent to most of this barrier of heavy traffic is a sound wall built to shield

8. Question 3: How will an increase in traffic volume be mitigated for in terms of the negative effects to wildlife movement and increase in vehicle-animal collisions? As noted in the Technical Memorandum, El Toro Creek at Hwy 68 provides one of the only safe passages for animals to move under the highway. They also note that there is currently a high amount of deer hit on Highway 68 (Pg 2 of Technical Memorandum by Michael Josselyn 12/8/2010, see below for exert).

Also, the proposed development of a road running through Toro County Park along Hwy 68 would significantly increase the amount of human-animal vehicle collisions as the proposed road would run right through the core part of the wildlife corridor, in which large animals such as deer, are known to travel routinely.

The current corridors for wildlife in this area are limited to El Toro Creek and the Portola Drive overpass (providing access to El Toro Regional Park) and possible culverts running beneath the highway. Those species that attempt to cross the road are subject to being killed. The Monterey County SPCA lists the areas of greatest deer activity at night as Pebble Beach, Carmel Valley Road, the Highway 68 corridor, Holman Highway, River Road, and Highway 1 from Seaside to south of Carmel. Two of these roads abut the Project Area. During the deer breeding season in fall, the SPCA responds to an average of 20 to 30 hit-by-car deer calls a month in these areas, with almost all the deer involved either dead on arrival or needing to be humanely euthanized immediately.

9. Nancy Sieple at Caltrans, a project partner, is developing a county habitat connectivity plan. The Caltrans District 5 Habitat Connectivity Plan is integrating the data collected from the Northern Monterey Linkage Project and designating habitat spanning along Highway 68 from Marks Ranch and Toro Park to the El Toro Hwy 68 underpass is a critical wildlife corridor for multiple species based on the data we collected and Northern Monterey Linkage report (Diamond et al 2010).

Jim Thorne was the senior scientific advisor for the Northern Monterey Linkage Project and author of the, Guide to Wildlands Conservation in the Central Coast Region of California 2002, and is also the senior scientist of the District 5 Habitat Connectivity Plan.

10-1
cont'd

Comment Letter 10 Continued

10. The draft 2010 Monterey County General Plan: states that the habitat from Fort Ord- El Toro Creek to Toro Park to the Salinas River is designated as Linkage 375 Highway 68- El Toro Creek Corridor. Concerning this Linkage 375, see page 4.

area connecting the open space lands of the habitat management areas. Policy B-3 requires the County to preserve, enhance, restore and protect vernal ponds, riparian corridors and other wetland areas. Biological Resources Policy E-2 requires the County to monitor activities that affect all undeveloped natural lands, including, but not limited to conservation areas and habitat corridors as specified and assigned in the HMP.

Toro Area Plan policies - Policy T-1.7 Development on properties with residential land use designations located within the Toro Area Plan along the Highway 68 corridor shall be limited to the first single family home on a legal lot of record.

Cachagua Area Plan policies - Policy CACH-1.4 stipulates that new development adjacent to the Ventana Wilderness not impact the purpose of the wilderness areas. Policy CACH-3.7 protects riparian vegetation and threatened fish species along the Carmel and Arroyo Seco Rivers. It also reduces encroachment from new development on the main channels of the Carmel and Arroyo Seco Rivers.

South of Toro County Park, land use designations are for resource conservation and grazing and there is limited agricultural conversion potential due to water constraints, access, and slopes and thus wildlife movement to the Sierra de Salinas/Santa Lucia Mountains from the Toro Area is not expected to be significantly impaired.

The Highway 68 corridor is a concern for wildlife movement, as identified in the DEIR due to residential and commercial development and the highway itself. Specific to the wildlife corridors connecting Toro County Park to Fort Ord and to the Salinas River, potential residential development between San Benancio Road and River Road is on large unsubdivided properties and thus Policy 3.1 would require preservation of portions of these properties to maintain extant wildlife movement opportunities.



10-1
cont'd

It is also noted in the draft Monterey General Plan that this area is designated for 1 home per 80 acres. 1 home per 40 acres = significant impacts to the wildlife.

Question 4: Why was the Policy information from the draft Monterey General Plan about wildlife corridors and impacts due to development that will result in impacts left out of the DEIR wildlife corridor discussion and mitigation?

Comment Letter 10 Continued

Question 5: How will the DEIR integrate the draft Monterey General Plan Policy 3.1 stating the requirement of preservation of portions of these large unsubdivided properties between San Benancio Road and River Road be maintained to extant wildlife movement opportunities?

Question 6: How will the DIER include mitigation necessary described by the draft Monterey General Plan for development over 1 house per 80 acres?

11. The location of the low income housing (Parcel E, eastern parcel) and winery/housing development (Parcel D) would further restrict wildlife movement in that area as it creates a narrowing of a bottleneck already present due to the Las Palmas Ranch development and other subdivisions to the east of Highway 68 at that location.

Question 7: Based on the draft Monterey General Plan Policy 3.1, this development needs to be decreased by housing units and density, how will the DEIR abide by Policy 3.1 or mitigate for this impact to wildlife movement at this location?

12. Further more, the low income housing (Parcel E) would most likely result in human-conflicts and depredation permits for an area that has been designated as a wildlife corridor by the Monterey General Plan. Developing housing units in an area of high animal movement would put at risk humans and animals in terms of; animal vehicle collision, loss of livestock and potential human-wildlife interactions.

Question 8: Why was the impacts to wildlife corridors in terms of human-wildlife conflicts not addresses in the DEIR?

8a. How will the human-wildlife conflict impacts to the wildlife corridor be addressed or mitigated for ?

13. The corridor would be cut off by the proposed housing development plan along Hwy 68 from housing units ranging from 72-135 by Toro Park and then severely constrained on the north side by Parcel E and D. Housing units need to be set back out of the corridor or greatly reduced in density in units 72-135, Parcel E and D to maintain the functionality of this wildlife corridor in allowing for animal movement and avoidance of human-wildlife conflicts.

Literature Cited:

Diamond, T. , C. McFarland, and J. Thorne. 2010. The Central Coast Connectivity Project: Northern Monterey County Linkages, Report on the Mount Toro to Fort Ord Reserve Study.

Ernest, H.B., W.M.Boyce, V.C. Bleich, B. May, S.J.Stiver, and S.T. Torres. 200. Genetic structure of mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) in California. *Conservation Genetics* 4: 353-366.

10-1
cont'd

Comment Letter 10 Continued

Gehrt, S.D., P.D. Riley, and B.L. Cypher. 2010. Urban Carnivores: Ecology, Conflict, and Conservation. The John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore.

Penrod, K., C. Cabanero, P. Beier, C. Luke, W. Spencer, E. Rubin, R. Sauvajot, S. Riley, and D. Kamradt. 2006. South Coast Missing Linkages Project: A Linkage Design for the Sierra Monica-Sierra Madre Connection.

Thorne, J., D. Cameron, and V. Jigour. 2002. The Guide to Wildlands Conservation in the Central Coast Region of California report.

LETTER #10 – CONNECTIVITY FOR WILDLIFE

Response to Comment 10-1

All comments in this letter address wildlife corridors, habitat connectivity, and the related analysis in the DEIR.

Please see Master Response 3, which addresses wildlife corridors in detail relative to the project. Please also see RDEIR Section 3.3. Section 3.3 has been updated and replaced in its entirety in the RDEIR.

The project has been processed and reviewed for consistency with the County's 1983 General Plan due to the timing of the original application. The current policies of the General Plan are not applicable to the project.

The widening of a portion of Highway 68 is addressed in Section 4.0 of the RDEIR. As an alternatives analysis, the discussion is not as specific as the EIR in terms of impacts to wildlife movement. However, the effect of Highway 68 as a barrier to movement is addressed in Master Response 3. As the highway is already a significant barrier to movement, the low volume of additional traffic trips cannot be expected to result in measurable impact with respect to vehicle-animal collisions.

Comment Letter 11

Subject: FW: DEIR Ferrini Ranch Subdivision

From: Janet Coyne [<mailto:janetsoocoyne@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2012 3:23 PM
To: Mack, David x5096; 112-Clerk of the Board Everyone
Subject: DEIR Ferrini Ranch Subdivision

Dear Mr. Mack,

As a resident along the Highway 68 corridor, I am very concerned about the proposed development of the Ferrini Ranch subdivision. I am very involved in the community and am concerned about our natural resources (water) and traffic congestion. I commute every day along Highway 68 and at 7:10 A.M., it can take up to 20 minutes to get from Portola Road to Corral de Tierra, which is a 4 mile stretch. I don't know about you, but I moved from the sprawling Phoenix area to this beautiful, quiet and serene area of Monterey County. I truly would be disappointed to have further development in this area. If I wanted all the hustle and bustle of city life, I would have stayed in Phoenix.

11-1

I hope you take my request seriously, please do what you can to stop the development of, yet, another subdivision in Monterey County.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration,

Janet Coyne

RESPONSE TO LETTER #11 – COYNE, JANET

Response to Comment 11-1

Commenter expresses general opposition to the project, citing traffic congestion and natural resources.

General comments are noted for the record. Please see Master Response 1 regarding these issues. See also Master Response 2 for additional information regarding potential water impacts.

Comment Letter 12

From: Mark Crossgrove [mccrossgrove@foxyproduce.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2012 9:19 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Project

Dave,

I wanted to let you know that I am not in favor of this project. Very disturbing to destroy one of the most beautiful areas in the country.

12-1

Mark Crossgrove

RESPONSE TO LETTER #12 – CROSSGROVE, MARK

Response to Comment 12-1

Commenter expresses general opposition to the project, citing aesthetics.

General comments are noted for the record.

Comment Letter 13

From: Sherwood Darington <sdarington@redshift.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 1:02 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Cc: Sherwood Darington; CARL HOLM
Subject: Ferrini Ranch

Dear Mr. Mack:

I have had an opportunity to review the current development plan for the Ferrini Ranch and have determined that the proposal has several good attributes in that it protects and preserves over 75 % of its land area for continuing the agricultural use of grazing cattle which will retain the current agricultural employment on the property, preserves the viewshed from Highway 68 for the traveling public's enjoyment by placing the single family lots as far from the highway as possible that will make it appear very similar to the Laguna Seca development along Highway 68, provides a beginning to the wine trail that will benefit the agriculture and hospitality industries which are the basic industries of Monterey County, and will also allow for the preservation of prime farmland in the Salinas Valley by providing an alternative for housing instead of paving over some of the finest and most productive farmland in the world.

13-1

The approval and development of the Ferrini Ranch as proposed on the current plans can be a win-win for all parties.

My comments are my personal views after reviewing the proposed development plans and are based on my lifelong residency in Monterey County with concern and admiration for the agricultural industry. My views and opinions on where development is appropriate has been derived from years of observations of changes in Monterey County. They do not represent any group, organization, or appointment that I may be associated with.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Sherwood Darington

RESPONSE TO LETTER #13 – DARINGTON, SHERWOOD

Response to Comment 13-1

Commenter is generally supportive of the project because it protects and preserves over 75% of the land for continuing agricultural use, preserves the Highway 68 viewshed, and provides an entrance to the wine trail and preserves prime farmland.

Comments are noted for the record. No response is warranted.

Comment Letter 14

Subject: FW: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Carole Day <rceday@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 16, 2012 at 4:26 PM
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Project
To: District5@co.monterey.ca.us

To Supervisors

We are concerned homeowners in the Toro Park area, and have attended both meetings pertaining to the ferrini ranch project. We are ADAMINTELY opposed to the project for several reasons. Their planned project has a negative impact on traffic , water, sewer. Their plan for low to moderate income housing greatly effects us personally. We live on 117 drive and the proposal for apartments and low income townhomes would drastically reduce our property values! It will also create an unsafe envirmnt for our neighborhood. We feel we are being DISCRIMINATED against by their decision to place these dwellings where they are proposing. We have hiway 68 in our front yard with traffic noise and the proposal would put a road with dwellings and traffic noise in our backyard. The plan tucks away the EYE SOARS right behind our home. We have lived in Salinas all our lives and

14-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #14 – DAY, CAROLE

Response to Comment 14-1

Commenter is generally opposed to the project due to traffic, water, sewer, and proposed inclusionary housing.

Commenter is referred to Master Response 1, Response to Comment 6-3, and to Master Response 2 regarding water.

Comment Letter 15

Subject: FW: Ferrini subdivision

From: David Duke [<mailto:duke@svseeds.us>]
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2012 5:36 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: Ferrini subdivision

Hello Mr. Mack,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Ferrini subdivision near San Benancio Rd. and Highway 68.

Given the daily traffic congestion on Highway 68, I cannot understand how anyone could begin to consider this project. EVERYDAY there are incredible backups on this highway.

We are living with the 2 lane highway that was in place 75 years ago while the population and commute traffic has increased many fold.

Furthermore, our water situation is critical. I have friends up San Benancio that must truck in water in dry years.

When the infrastructure and water supply has changed.....we can discuss this project.

Until then, this is a very bad idea and is totally inappropriate for the area.

Please contact me with any questions.

Best regards,
David Duke
Cell: 831.595.2449

15-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #15 – DUKE, DAVID

Response to Comment 15-1

Commenter states that project should only be considered once infrastructure (water and roadways) has been addressed.

Comments are noted for the record. Please see Master Responses 1 and 2 regarding these issues.

Comment Letter 16

11/14/12

David Mack, Planning Department, Monterey Country Resource
Management Agency,
168 Alisal Street, 2nd Floor,
Salinas, CA, 93901

Re: Ferrini Ranch Development

Dear Mr. Mack:

I have three concerns about the Ferrini Ranch development. The first is that the scenic view-shed will be forever altered. It does not appear that there has been appropriate consideration of what views, and whose views, will be altered if this development is approved. If this development is approved, though you might not be able to see the new homes on the hillside from Highway 68, *you will see* four lanes of asphalt, a traffic light, and a sound barrier wall. This look will affect all people traveling down the highway to and from Monterey. The rural look of the pine and oaks trees, that are on the green belt between Highway 68 and the homes, will have to be removed to make way for the four lane road. The people living in those homes will no longer have a lovely view of the hillside across from the highway but of a sound barrier wall. Now, when you are walking or driving in Toro Park on Portola Drive, one has a view of the hills of Toro Regional Park. When this development goes in, that view will no longer be just of the rolling hills, but also of homes on the hills.

The second issue is the noise that will be created by increasing the road from two lanes to four. The Draft EIR says that the noise will be increased slightly. No matter how much it is increased, there should be plans in place to help diminish that noise not only for the people living directly along the highway, but also for every home in Toro Park. The solution for noise should be in keeping with the rural atmosphere

16-1

Comment Letter 16 Continued

of trees, native bushes and hills. Clearly, a sound wall would not meet that criteria.

The third huge issue is the traffic congestion along Highway 68 that would be created by adding a new stoplight to the thoroughfare right before four lanes narrow down to two lanes. I see no way that a stoplight in that location will have anything but a negative effect upon an already congested highway. Between 7:15am and 8:00am the traffic already backs up to the Portola Drive exit and beyond. This congestion is due to the stoplights at San Benancio Road and Corral de Tierra Road, which are only a half-mile farther west than the proposed new third light. The two current lights also contribute to eastbound evening traffic backup to Laureles Grade. Adding another light will only further choke off the flow of traffic between Salinas and Monterey during morning and evening commutes. Those commuters who must use Highway 68 will suffer far greater congestion than already exists.

16-1
cont'd

Thank you,



Hetty and Jim Eddy
22307 Davenrich St.
Salinas, Ca 93908

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

RESPONSE TO LETTER #16 – EDDY, HETTY & JIM

Response to Comment 16-1

Commenters are opposed to the project due to the changes in visual character, visual changes from Alternative 3B, impacts to the scenic route, increased levels of mobile source noise, and increased traffic congestion associated proposed traffic signal (with Alternative 3B).

Please see Master Response 1 and response to comment 27-1 regarding aesthetics, views, and viewsheds. Changes in visual character associated with Alternative 3B are addressed in Section 4.0 of the RDEIR, as well as within the Alternative 5 analysis of the RDEIR. Please see also Section 4.0 of the RDEIR for additional supporting detail regarding changes in noise levels from proposed highway improvements. Traffic operations with the alternative project entrance and new signal on State Route 68 are also addressed in Master Response 1.

Comment Letter 17

From: LeRoy <lfrsnet@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 1:08 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: #PLN040758

Attn. David Mack

The proposed Ferrini Ranch development is indeed attractive. 40 years ago when my wife and I were considering buying in Toro Park Estates. Bollenbecker and Kelton had just purchased the property highway 68 from Toro Park (apparently the Ferrini Ranch) and were planning to develop it. We almost decided to wait until we could buy in this beautiful oak-studded development -- we didn't and did buy in Toro Park. I'm still in this home.

With other developments in the Toro area, Hwy 68 is impossible from 7:15 AM to 8:45AM and 4:00PM to 6:PM weekdays. This is so when conditions are normal. Add a fender-bender or some construction and you have a parking lot. I would strongly encourage you to visit this area during the week in the above mentioned times to really sense the extent of the existing problem.

A four lane extension of 68 west to Toro Creek bridge will not prevent the two-lane bottlenecks at San Benancio and Corral de Tierra roads and further west to Monterey. Added development along 68 must be deferred until 68 can be widened all the way to Monterey or an alternate route of freeway quality thru the former Fort Ord property be completed.

I would also have concerns on the Ferrini Ranch project on where runoff rain water will go. If the plan is to direct same to Toro Creek south and west of Toro Park Estates, we can expect flooding at various times in the Estates and further down at the Creekside subdivision. We had problems in these areas in 1998 and Creekside again around 2000 -- without Ferrini Ranch runoff.

Let's not add to existing problems to the point of not just inconvenience but real safety issues such as fire and medical.

Thank You.
LeRoy Frame --lfrsnet@gmail.com

17-1

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

RESPONSE TO LETTER #17 – FRAME, LEROY

Response to Comment 17-1

Commenter is opposed to the project due to existing traffic congestion on Highway 68, runoff, and flooding.

Commenter is referred to Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Project drainage is addressed in Section 3.7 of the DEIR. Figure 3.7-3 of the DEIR illustrates the local watersheds and proposed detention basins for the project. A preliminary drainage plan for the project has been prepared, and all final plans must meet Monterey County Water Resources Agency standards for design and performance to prevent drainage and flooding problems.

Potential runoff and erosion impacts are identified as less than significant and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.5-5a. The proposed project's potential for exposure to flooding is addressed under Impact 3.7-4 starting on page 3.7-23 of the DEIR, which is identified as less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.7-4. See also response to comment D-3.

Comment Letter 18

Leticia Gascoin-Ruffie
22274 Davenrich Street
Salinas, CA 93908
titagascoin@gmail.com

November 15, 2012.

Re : FERRINI RANCH PROJECT

Attention : Mr. Mike Novo, Director of Planning
Mr. David Mack, County Planner for Project

Dear Sirs,

My opinion on the building of a new development in an already problematic area is that, although the project, per se, seems to be relatively well planned, it will only aggravate existing issues.

We have a serious traffic problem most of the day except for a few hours after the morning rush hour, but considering that so much of the population has no other choice than to take Highway 68 to commute to the Monterey Peninsula, it would be totally irresponsible to add any more developments along that highway without examining a solution.

I am concerned about a new intersection with lights which could be connected to a new road off of Portola. Most of the people who have chosen to live in Toro Park came here because of its proximity to nature. If we chose to be out in the country it has its disadvantages but also its advantages. Many people walk their dogs or jog or run with their children in strollers. Some come to ride their horses. There is a trail which runs parallel to Highway 68 which is a very enjoyable walk with magnificent old pine trees under which mycologists can find mushrooms. Should the intersection be modified to have four lanes and a traffic light, the land between the trail and the highway will become the highway. The highway will run very close to the people's back yards. This will cause pollution (e.g. noise and exhaust) as well as a danger in the case of an accident. What about a fire?

18-1

Comment Letter 18 Continued

Another dramatic issue has been the water issue. My parents having lived in Toro Park before me, and I can remember times when families were rationed in water during periods of draught, and when residents had visitors, they called the water company to be allotted extra water for their guests. I don't know if this has ever been the case since or if we have had such extreme draught in recent years, but with an ever-rising population and a possible natural change of climate, this could again become a reality.

18-2

I will mention the sewer problem but having moved here just recently, I don't think I am sufficiently informed to make a comment.

I would like to emphasize that Highway 68 is considered a "scenic highway". However, long traffic lines do not add to its beauty. It has always been a dangerous road for decades and it certainly is a shame not to be able to enjoy the scenery because of traffic, but also, because of some building projects which have been allowed to mar the countryside. When a project receives approval, we never know what it will look like in the end, and often it is much larger or looks quite different than originally planned.

18-3

Let us not forget that we are in earthquake country. Building houses on hills and hilltops or steep slopes is somewhat of a risk. How do you get help to an area when most roads run into Highway 68?

18-4

We are lucky to live in such a beautiful area. We have landmarks like the field where the bulls graze past River Road. We have Toro Park. We have the old Fort Ord hills, but for how long? New developments are springing up all the time. Do we have enough jobs for all the people we are importing to our area? So many houses are still for sale, do we really need to destroy our virgin lands to build still more?

I appreciate your taking time to listen to my opinion.
Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the above address.

I remain,
Sincerely yours,

Tita Gascoin
titagascoin@gmail.com

RESPONSE TO LETTER #18 – GASOIN-RUFFIE, LETICIA

Response to Comment 18-1

Comments express concern regarding existing traffic congestion along Highway 68, alternative intersection location and widening of Highway 68, loss of trails within the state right-of-way, noise, and safety.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding these issues.

Response to Comment 18-2

Commenter cites general concerns regarding water supply and reliability.

Please see Master Response 2 regarding water concerns.

Response to Comment 18-3

Aesthetics, impacts to the scenic highway and appearance of the final developed project.

The potential impact to the State Route 68 scenic corridor and other local scenic roadways is addressed under Impact 3.1-4 starting on page 3.1-45 of the DEIR, which is identified as a significant and unavoidable impact if the original project entrance concept is pursued. Section 3.1 of the DEIR specifies the applicable policies and development review and approval procedures that are required subsequent to subdivision approval, which ultimately affect the appearance of the built environment.

Response to Comment 18-4

Seismic safety and emergency response.

Potential seismic hazard impacts are addressed under Impacts 3.5-1 through 3.5-4 starting on page 3.5-23 of the DEIR. These impacts are identified as less than significant or less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.5-1, MM 3.5-2a, and MM 3.5-2b. The project is required to meet all building codes and standards for emergency access.

Comment Letter 19

From: mgawlowski@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 1:31 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Cc: 112-Clerk of the Board Everyone
Subject: Ferrini DEIR

Mr. Mack,

I would like to let you know that I am have great concerns regarding the Ferrini development.(DEIR)

1. There will be huge traffic impacts in the area that have not been adequately addressed
2. Water is such an issue now, before any construction even begins, therefore more information is needed on the baseline conditions
3. Current data is needed for the wildlife corridors. The information was from years ago and we need updated results.
4. The numerous building sites are not outside the critical viewshed.
Do not build on hilltops, or slopes with a 30% or greater angle, or behind added berms.

Please consider these issues.

Thank you,

Mickey Gawlowski
resident on San Benancio Rd

19-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #19 – GAWLOWSKI, MICKEY

Response to Comment 19-1

Comments express concerns regarding traffic congestion, baseline water conditions, wildlife corridors and age of data, building within the critical viewshed, and ridgeline and steep slope impacts.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion concerns and Master Response 3 regarding wildlife corridors.

Critical viewsheds are illustrated in Figures 3.1-1A and 3.1-1B of the DEIR. The project's potential impact to critical viewsheds and areas of visual sensitivity is addressed under Impact 3.1-1 starting on page 3.1-18 of the DEIR. Mitigation is provided requiring changes to the project to remove residential lots from the critical viewshed or otherwise confirm that development is not visible. Impacts remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation, however, due to the proposed Ferrini Ranch Road. Please see also Alternative 5 of the RDEIR, which makes adjustments to the lots within the critical viewshed.

General comments regarding development on slopes and hilltops are noted for the record. The potential visual impact due to development on slopes greater than 30 percent is addressed under Impact 3.1-5 starting on page 3.1-47 of the DEIR, which is identified as less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.5-2a and MM 3.5-2b, and MM 3.5-5a through MM 3.5-5c. The potential for ridgeline development impacts as viewed from common public viewing areas is addressed under Impact 3.1-6 starting on page 3.1-49 of the DEIR.

Please see Master Response 2 regarding water. See also response to comment 27-1, Master Response 1, and responses to comments 36-4 through 36-10 regarding aesthetics and visual impacts.