

Comment Letter 60

From: susw09@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 1:13 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Cc: 112-Clerk of the Board Everyone
Subject: Ferrini Ranch DEIR

Dear David Mack,

Please note that the Ferrini Ranch Project has many issues that need to be considered. All buildings need to be out of the critical viewshed and berms created to hide the structures is ridiculous. The hillslopes are greater than 30%. The wildlife corridor information is many years outdated. The area is zoned for low density residential. As always, water is an issue with inadequate data on baseline conditions. There is no capacity for the extra traffic before construction happens. This Ferrini Project is not a smart idea to develop.

60-1

Sincerely,
Sue Shaw
218 San Benancio Rd

RESPONSE TO LETTER #60 – SHAW, SUE

Response to Comment 60-1

Comments are concerned with development within the critical viewshed, use of berms, hillside development, wildlife corridors, water, traffic, and site zoning.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding these issues. See also Master Response 2 regarding water, and Master Response 3 regarding wildlife corridors.

Comment Letter 61

From: nancy skager <nancyskager@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 3:09 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Development

This email is to voice my opposition to the proposed development on Highway 68 -- Ferrini Ranch.

I have lived in Toro Park since 1975. The area is the most special area I know of and am very concerned for many reasons about the proposed home development. I have watched the county grow in so many ways and one of the most obvious is the traffic pattern on Highway 68. The traffic will be changed dramatically, regardless of the extra lanes. An estimated 2000 trips on the highway a day. I already am squeezing to enter the line of traffic at 7 AM to go to work in Monterey. On the trip home I might be on 68 as much as 40 minutes, sometimes more.

The sound is another factor influencing my NO vote. This is a quiet area which has already felt the growth of trucks and cars -- all related to traffic, once again.

HAVE we looked at WATER? Water has been a huge issue for this area for years, decades.

And another issue is the impact on the school district;. This has been downplayed by the developers. Sounds like "only 60 students" will be additional to the current enrollment. As a school employee, I know the impact of this number of students. Again, everyone drives their children to school and we will now have an additional 50-60 cars dropping children off at the school sites.

Please be so very careful about voting for this development. We live in a prized area -- Monterey County.

People come from all over the world to spend vacation dollars and time because of the pristine beauty of this area. Please refer to today's Letter to Editor in the Herald!!

This person from NC felt so strongly about the area she wrote a letter to the Editor!!

Thank you very much. You will see hundreds of people at the Supervisor's meetings regarding Ferrini Ranch!

The obvious answer is NO!

Thank you

Nancy Skager
831-596-2840

61-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #61 – SKAGER, NANCY

Response to Comment 61-1

Comments express concerns regarding traffic on Highway 68, water supply, and school impacts.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic, Response to Comment 6-1 regarding schools and student generation, and Master Response 2 regarding water.

Comment Letter 62

Subject: FW: Ferrini Ranch

-----Original Message-----

From: Frank Smith [<mailto:franknliz1014@aol.com>]

Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2012 10:02 AM

To: Mack, David x5096

Subject: Ferrini Ranch

Dear Mr. Mack,

I am writing to voice my opposition to allowing 215 houses to go up across from Toro Park homes. I have lived in Toro Park for 32 years and have seen the traffic on Highway 68 increase yearly. You should try to get out on the highway during rush hours it is crazy.

The commuters travel inside Toro Park along Portola just to try to beat some traffic. Can you imagine how many cars will be on the highway with 215 new homes. And who will buy these homes? Are not the Fort Ord homes at a stand still because of the economy?

The hills are beautiful the way they are. Can't we try to save them by enclosing them in the Toro Regional Park. Please oppose this development.

Thank you,

Frank and Elizabeth Smith

62-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #62 – SMITH, FRANK & ELIZABETH

Response to Comment 62-1

Comments cite concerns with traffic impacts to Highway 68, traffic cutting through the Toro Park Estates neighborhood, and impacts to the viewshed.

Please see Master Response 1.

Comment Letter 63

LAW OFFICES OF
MICHAEL W. STAMP

Michael W. Stamp
Molly Erickson
Olga Mikheeva

479 Pacific Street, Suite One
Monterey, California 93940

Telephone (831) 373-1214
Facsimile (831) 373-0242

November 16, 2012

Via Email

Mike Novo, Planning Director
David Mack, Associate Planner
County of Monterey
168 W. Alisal Street, 2d Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Subject: Comments on the Ferrini Ranch Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Novo and Mr. Mack:

This Office represents The Open Monterey Project (TOMP), which expresses concerns about the Ferrini Ranch Draft Environmental Impact Report. TOMP submits the following comments on the Draft EIR.

The rubber dam built as part of the Salinas Valley Water Project did not work in 2012. That affects the effectiveness of the Salinas Valley Water Project. The Draft EIR failed to adequately consider that information.

63-1

The County has acknowledged repeatedly that the Salinas Valley Water Project success or failure will not be known until at least ten years have passed.

Zone 2C is not equivalent to the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. The groundwater reports to the MCWRA are for Zones 2 and 2A. They are not for Zone 2C or for the entire groundwater basin.

There is no discussion in the Draft EIR of the precedent-setting nature of the project, specifically of the exportation of groundwater from the 180/400 Foot Aquifer to an area outside of the Salinas Valley – Corral de Tierra. The Ferrini Ranch project could set a countywide precedent for exportation to the Seaside Basin. (See Figure 3.6-1.) The Draft EIR failed to adequately consider that information.

63-2

There is no cap on water demand for the project. There must be enforceable cap as to each use and each lot, and as to the project as a whole. The Draft EIR failed to adequately consider that information.

63-3

TOMP requests that the County require an enforceable cap to water use – on a per-lot basis and also on the project as a whole – as a mitigation prior to approval. Otherwise the estimated water use can be exceeded and cause unmitigated and unanalyzed impacts.

Comment Letter 63 Continued

Mike Novo, Planning Director
David Mack, Associate Planner
November 16, 2012
Page 2

TOMP requests that the EIR consider a mitigation requiring the water usage of each lot be reported yearly to the County and the data be available to the public. Compliance with water conditions and mitigations should be transparent and publicly verifiable. This mitigation would be a step toward providing that transparency and public verifiability.

63-3
cont'd

Figure 3.6-4 is unnecessarily confusing and should be corrected. The top two cross sections are of a different scale than the geologic map shown on the bottom half of the page. In addition to being different scales, the map on the bottom is aligned differently on the page, because is it almost an inch closer to the left margin than the top two cross sections. These make it almost impossible for the public to understand or match up the information on the figures. The effort to obscure the information in the figure appears to be deliberate. The figure should be corrected to address the problems identified above.

63-4

The numbers (figures) in the EIR tables and charts are not vertically aligned. That makes the numbers difficult to read, and obscures the significance of the information. It appears that this effort was deliberate. Please make all the numbers (figures) vertically aligned.

Even if there is some amount of water recharge at the Ferrini Ranch site, downstream of Ferrini Ranch the 180 Foot Aquifer is not used as water supply due to seawater intrusion. The 400 Foot Aquifer is also only used very little. Therefore, any recharge to the groundwater basin would not be usable recharge. Please respond.

63-5

Please list, and show on a map, all active production wells between Ferrini Ranch and the Monterey Bay, and show the aquifer from which the well produces supply. Also, please show the direction of groundwater flows. That is the only way to show whether any Ferrini recharge could be usable.

The project would pump usable water from 180 and 400 Foot Aquifers near Spreckels, and render the water unusable from thence forward.

Please state the date of the application. Please clarify how the date of completeness of April 24, 2005 (p. 3.9-3) was determined.

Please clarify which General Plan and which zoning ordinance applies.

63-6

The Draft EIR appears to have used an incorrect and inaccurate analysis of the County's Title 19. (See p. 3.9-17.) The EIR applies the current Title 19. The DEIR analysis must be redone and recirculated using the proper version of Title 19.

Comment Letter 63 Continued

Mike Novo, Planning Director
David Mack, Associate Planner
November 16, 2012
Page 3

The project and the alternatives fail to adequately attempt to design the project so as to avoid slopes over 25% and over 30%.

The project represents unwise, sprawling, unclustered new development on undeveloped slopes. None of the alternatives depart from that outmoded and resource-intensive approach. The EIR should include several alternatives that avoid this approach.

63-7

The alternatives analysis does not adequately propose or evaluate alternatives with fewer units, or without the commercial element. The EIR should include several alternatives with significantly fewer units.

We have repeatedly told the County that material DEIR references are not available to the public. This failure to provide the references upon request violates CEQA. The DEIR circulation period should begin only after all references are available. We have addressed this problem in other letters to the County. We submit these comments today out of an abundance of caution.

63-8

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL W. STAMP


Molly Erickson

RESPONSE TO LETTER #63 – ERICKSON, MOLLY (LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL STAMP/THE OPEN MONTEREY PROJECT)

Response to Comment 63-1

Reliability of the Salinas Valley Water Project and project location in Zone 2C.

See Master Response 2 regarding these issues. See also responses to comments 36-57 through 36-68.

Response to Comment 63-2

Comment argues that project could set a precedent for transfer of groundwater to locations outside the Salinas Valley.

The DEIR evaluates the project as proposed based upon its location within the Zone 2C assessment area. This project, similar to any other territory within this special assessment zone, would be expected to be eligible for the benefits of the improvements to which it contributes. The County sees no particular precedent, as all lands within the assessment area should be treated equally. The project location is in the Corral de Tierra subbasin of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, not the Seaside Area subbasin.

Response to Comment 63-3

Comment suggests a cap on water demand/water use within the subdivision.

The DEIR Section 3.6 estimates the water demand of the project. The County of Monterey has confidence in the demand estimates and projected water use of the project based on the analysis in the DEIR, which is based on a comparison of several residential consumption rates for similar projects (DEIR Tables 3.6-2 and 3.6-3). CEQA requires a defensible analysis of the project's anticipated environmental effects—in this case, water use—which has been provided.

Response to Comment 63-4

Comments on figures and tables.

Comments regarding scale differences in Figure 3.6-4 and alignment of numbers are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 63-5

Groundwater recharge/"usable recharge."

Pre- and post-project recharge of the project site is detailed on pages 3.6-36 through -39 of the DEIR. Table 3.6-4 of the DEIR illustrates that the recharge values at the site are minor, consisting of only 0.58 acre-feet annually of recharge into the local subbasin, compared to 95.17 acre-feet annually of projected water use. This is factual information, and the DEIR makes no claim that the recharge is intended to substantially offset or replace water use. As described on page 3.6-2 of the DEIR and illustrated in Figure 3.6-1, the project site is located in the Corral de Tierra Area

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

Subbasin of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (SVGB). The project will be served from water pumped from the adjacent 180/400-Foot Aquifer Subbasin. Both subbasins are part of the SVGB.

Response to Comment 63-6

Date of application and applicable General Plan and zoning documents.

The project application was deemed complete as part of the County's standard application review process. The 1982 General Plan is applicable to the project based on the application date. Please see page 3.9-25 of the DEIR for the list of document references. The language and code citations noted from the December 2000 version of Title 19 and the version currently accessed on the County website have not changed.

Response to Comment 63-7

Project design relative to slopes over 25% and 30% and project alternatives.

As described on page 3.1-47 of the DEIR, lots have been sited primarily on slope areas of less than 30 percent. However, some roads, water facilities, and portions of some lots contain slopes of greater than 30 percent. The DEIR analyzes the subdivision as proposed by the applicant and explains the General Plan policy and conditions under which the County may consider approving improvements in steeper slope areas. Pages 3.1-48 and -49 of the DEIR analyze these policies and the rationale for a less than significant finding related to aesthetics. The alternatives, particularly Alternative 2 ("Flatland" Design), provide a development alternative that would eliminate construction in areas with slopes greater than 30 percent.

Alternative 4, the Compact Footprint alternative, transfers density into more compact nodes in order to cluster development as a method of avoiding or reducing impacts in several categories. All alternatives selected for analysis are intended to reduce or avoid the potential impacts of the project while attaining most of the basic objectives of the proposal, consist with CEQA. Alternative 5 in the RDEIR is also intended to avoid several impacts, including slope areas.

Response to Comment 63-8

DEIR references.

References cited throughout the DEIR are listed in Section 7.0 of the document. All physical documents cited have been compiled by the County in electronic form and have been made available upon request. The DEIR also refers to several instances of "personal communications" between individuals and the EIR preparers. The substance of those communications has been incorporated into the DEIR with no other physical documentation.

Comment Letter 64

From: Whitney Stolich <tinker@stolich.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 9:09 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: Ferrini Ranch

I went to the meeting that Amy White gave at San Benancio School about the huge subdivision being proposed on the 866 acres. Even though this subdivision

was brought up before the Torro Moratorium I am amazed that this huge proposal was still in progress. With no water in our area and a highway that is rated F

and wanting to build on slopes that are over the limit of 30% and in the view shed in some instances seems like a no win situation. The over lay showing where the development was going

was a great help in understanding the vastness of this subdivision.

What really floored me was the action to try and have the county buy a portion of Torro Park for one of their entrances to HWY. 68. Unbelievable!!

Besides putting 2000 cars on the HWY., the population is going to greatly impact Spreckels Schools and Salinas High. The West side the subdivision will be very close to

Torro Elementary School with dust and noise. The East side with the huge Winery sounds like an industrial park which has no business in this area.

Removing 921 trees could result in land erosion when wet weather comes. To destroy the natural beauty of this ranch and built in the view shed in many cases should not be allowed.

It is also going to impact wildlife as their territory will be greatly changed and where they roamed freely will no longer be as their corridors will be shifted and in many instances blocked.

There are so many negative impacts that it is a bit overwhelming. I hope the Board of Supervisors will take the time to listen to everyone that has concerns and study this

huge proposal with great care.

Whitney Stolich

64-1

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

RESPONSE TO LETTER #64 – STOLICH, WHITNEY

Response to Comment 64-1

Comments express concerns regarding water supply, traffic, take of parkland, impacts to schools, increased noise levels, agricultural industrial use, impacts on biological resources, potential for erosion, and impacts to viewsheds.

Regarding the issues raised, please see Master Response 2 regarding water supply concerns; Response to Comment 3-1 regarding impacts to Toro County Park, Master Response 1 regarding traffic; Response to Comment 6-1 regarding schools; Response to Comments 17-1, 55-3, and 63-7 regarding slope and erosion; Master Response 1 regarding viewsheds; Section 3.3 of the RDEIR and Master Response 3 regarding biological resources and wildlife corridors; and Section 4.0 of the RDEIR (analysis of Alternatives 3 and 5 and supporting noise report) regarding noise near the Toro Park Estates neighborhood.

Comment Letter 65

From: darryl stone <stonestaging@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 11:31 AM
To: 112-Clerk of the Board Everyone
Cc: Janice Stone
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Project

Hi there,

I just wanted to let you know some of my feelings about this Ferrini Ranch Project of which I am against. I have serious concerns about where the water is going to come from for the 212 new homes, the damage to the beautiful views we all love, what happens to the wildlife in the area that will be disturbed and of course the additional traffic beginning with development of the land, construction and then the homeowners. What happens to the property values especially to the homeowners that back up to highway 68? Widening the highway will put traffic much closer than they are now I don't think that will do anything but hurt property values.

Janice Stone
Toro Park Estates

65-1

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

RESPONSE TO LETTER #65 – STONE, DARRYL AND JANICE

Response to Comment 65-1

Comments express concern regarding water supply, potential impacts to viewsheds, biological resources, traffic, highway widening, and impacts on property values.

Please refer to Master Response 1, Master Response 2, and Section 3.3 of the RDEIR.

Comment Letter 66

From: Scott Sturvist <scott@sspre.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 2:32 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Cc: Holm, Carl P. x5103
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Subdivision

Hi David,

I thought I would drop you a line as I know the Ferrini Ranch Subdivision is stirring up some in the neighborhood. I have been both a Land Surveyor for 16 years here in Salinas and, now, for the past 17 years I have operated my Real Estate Company here in Toro Park. After reviewing the plans and ideas of Mark and Ray, this subdivision looks to be well thought out. It has my full support! I believe that it will help increase our values here in Toro Park and the surrounding areas. It's nice to finally see normal sized homes being built on acreage not the Southern California cram and built subdivision like Las Palmas. That's my biggest complaint when showing Las Palmas Homes to prospective buyers and the biggest reasons for people selling and moving out of Las Palmas. My biggest concern was losing the Lupin fields, I think that Mark and Ray are doing a service to the community with their design...keeping most, if not all, future homes hidden and the Lupin fields intact for the natural beauty that they provide in our hectic pace. I think that most of the complaints that I hear are the perceived traffic problems, once discussed most understand that this subdivision may actually help our congestion within Toro Park and that the new traffic light location was in the future Toro Park Plan before the Ferrini Ranch plan was put together. Toro Park has been needing a acceleration lane at Torero Drive and Hwy 68 for years. I believe if that was put in at the same time as the deceleration lane some 5 years ago a lot of this traffic talk would be mute. I travel this roadway everyday and the only reason for the back up on Hwy 68 are the cars stopping on Hwy 68 to let people on the Hwy from Torero Drive in Toro Park. Once you pass Toro Cafe the traffic pace picks up as normal rush hour traffic. I think that the county should get on board and grant this subdivision and get these traffic issues solved once and for all. Feel free to call me with any questions.

66-1

Thank You and Have a Great Day!

Scott Sturvist
Broker/Owner
DRE#01198763
MCAR Board Member, Director
Scott Sturvist Properties
Your Key to Sun Blessed Properties
Cell 831.905.9876 Office 831.484.6621
Efax 831.789.1816
scott@sspre.com
22758 Portola Drive Salinas, Ca. 93908
Located off Hwy 68 in the Toro Park Shopping Center



1

2.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

RESPONSE TO LETTER #66 – STURVIST, SCOTT

Response to Comment 66-1

Comments are in support for the proposed project.

Comment noted. No response is necessary.

Comment Letter 67

DAVID G. SWANSON
22714 Picador Drive
Salinas, CA 93908

November 13, 2012

Monterey County Planning Department
168 West Alisal Street
Salinas, CA 93901
Attn: David J.R. Mack


SUBJECT: COMMENT ON DRAFT EIR FOR FERRINI RANCH SUBDIVISION
FILE NO.: PLN 040758

Dear Mr. Mack;

I have attached my comments regarding the draft Environmental Impact Report for the Ferrini Ranch Subdivision. I understand that your office is accepting comment until November 16, 2012.

Please advise me if I have my dates wrong, or if you are not the person to whom this should be addressed.

Yours,



David G. Swanson

Enclosure

Comment Letter 67 Continued

Comment on Ferrini Ranch Subdivision Draft EIR - Project File PLN040758

General Comment:

Impacts of development should be evaluated on three levels: impact upon the community as a whole; impact upon the immediate neighbors; and impact upon the site itself. The impact analysis found in the DEIR appears to be focused upon the greater community (e.g., alternatives that are predicted to have no net impact upon commute time between Salinas and Monterey) and upon the site itself (e.g., loss of oak trees or of tiger salamander habitat). The review and attention paid to the immediate neighbors is much less, hence the major flaw in the DEIR.

If the analysis and mitigations set forth in the DEIR are accepted by Monterey County then the longstanding practice of the County to allow development along the Highway 68 Corridor without requiring adequate mitigation measures with regard to existing, unacceptable levels of service for the Corridor will continue unabated. Perhaps the most glaring example of this practice is the Pasadera development where the traffic mitigations served simply to provide ease of access for the subdivision and for the housing using Boots Road, rather than attempting to address the negative impact upon those already using Highway 68.

67-1

There is a persistent, and misleading, use of the term 'clustered' in the DEIR. With the exception of the inclusionary units, none of the other development meets either the common definition of the term by professional planners nor the layman. Dribbling 167 building lots, that average 1.2 acres, along winding roads over 800+ acres is not clustering. Figure 2-3B labels the Toro Sunshine and Serra Village communities incorrectly as "Toro Estates Development."

Comment regarding Alternative 3B:

Circulation and Transportation

♦ This alternative proposes adding 2 lanes to Highway 68 for a distance of about one mile, west of existing Torero connection. The noise level, which is already above the target of 55 dBA/day and 50 dBA/night for sensitive uses, will surely increase unless extraordinary measures are implemented to reduce this impact. This is particularly true because a traffic signal will mean stopping and starting of traffic, including large semi's, buses, and other vehicles larger than automobiles.

67-2

It is very difficult for the community to evaluate this alternative when the actual location of the added lanes, their distance from Toro Park Estates houses, the median treatment, and the inclusion of sound barriers is not provided. This information needs to be made available, and, the erection of illustrative fencing and story poles needs to be done in order for the neighboring subdivision to see where the expanded highway will actually be. Existing noise levels at residential property lines along Espada Drive and Bravo Place need to be measured to establish a baseline.

♦ Development of bicycle and pedestrian paths along the south edge of Highway 68 is very desirable, and should be included in the final project.

Page 1 of 3

Comment Letter 67 Continued

♦ What is the logic behind the assertion that adding two lanes, and thereby moving the merge point westward, will reduce traffic that ‘cuts through’ the Toro Park Subdivision via Portola Road? Commuters and other regular traffic will quickly learn when traffic backs up and will have no new reason not to try to speed up their trip by cutting through on Portola. Moreover, the promise of a signal at the end will ensure easy access back onto the Highway.

67-2
cont'd

♦ Will not school children safety be compromised when Torero is made a cul-de-sac and westbound cut-through drivers are given an additional distance before they need to slow in order to turn?

Comment regarding Project as proposed:

Circulation & Transportation

♦ Despite shown emergency access roads, the numerous cul-de-sacs shown on the Western Parcel are much too long to be safe considering the potential for wildfires and for accidents blocking the narrow roads.

♦ The short road at San Benancio serving 12 lots (Road B) should obviously be connected (yes, a bridge may be needed due to the creek/wildlife corridor) to the rest of the western portion of the subdivision (Road D). This would provide the needed additional access to the bulk of the new units, thereby disbursing traffic to and from the development rather than have only one access point for 150 lots. This would also make use of the recently completed upgrade of the Highway 68/San Benancio intersection.

67-3

♦ The outlet of the primary access road should not be immediately adjacent to the eastbound exit ramp from Highway 68, but should be pulled farther west when the entrance to the Regional Park is redone in order to minimize vehicle conflicts.

Housing

♦ Inclusionary units should be provided on-site (as proposed) and should not be allowed to be moved off-site, nor should the developer be allowed to pay fees in-lieu of providing this needed housing.

♦ The clustering of all inclusionary units in one very small portion of the entire site is less than desirable. It may be that such clustering is more efficient for the developer with regard to both construction and ongoing management, but, at a minimum these units should be put into two or three clusters. Perhaps a few adjacent to the ‘winery’ site and some at the western end, near San Benancio (in order to have access to MST at Highway 68).

Comment regarding Alternative 4:

Circulation and Transportation

♦ This alternative depicts a grade-separated interchange. The existing such intersections (Portola at Highway 68 and River/Reservation Roads at Highway 68) are examples of how such intersections are vastly superior to at-grade intersections with traffic signals. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian safety are vastly improved plus through traffic is not obligated to stop and start, speeding up travel times as well as reducing

67-4

Comment Letter 67 Continued

fuel use and air pollution. The elaborate ramping shown in the concept, however, is not necessary as the intersection need only serve Ferrini Ranch units and need not connect to Portola if the existing at-grade Torero intersection is left as-is. All that would be necessary is either a below-grade or flyover connection allowing subdivision vehicles to proceed to the west. Moreover, the Official Plan Line for Highway 68 (as shown on the map for Alternative 3B) shows sufficient space to develop such an intersection using mainly land on the south side of the existing two lanes of Highway 68, meaning the impact upon existing Toro Park houses could be minimized.

- ♦ Employing 'development nodes' is a sensible way to promote a sense of community among the residents, as well as a more efficient land use pattern. Walking would be encouraged and inter-subdivision vehicle trips reduced.

**67-4
cont'd**

RESPONSE TO LETTER #67 – SWANSON, DAVID

Response to Comment 67-1

General comments and approach to the DEIR analysis.

The DEIR identifies the physical environmental effects that could occur with project implementation. The scope of the impacts discussed is dependent upon the type of effect. The comment is correct that tree removal is more closely associated with site-specific impacts, while traffic effects represent more far-reaching “off-site” impacts. In response to several comments regarding neighborhood-level impacts, please see Master Response 1, as well as the RDEIR document, which addresses more localized noise and air quality impacts.

Response to Comment 67-2

Alternative 3B circulation, impacts of highway widening, cut-through traffic, noise, and safety.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding these issues. Please see also the RDEIR document and the evaluation of Alternative 5.

Response to Comment 67-3

Comments focus on the project as proposed, specifically emergency access, internal circulation, primary access location, inclusionary housing, and clustering of inclusionary units.

Regarding wildfire protection and emergency access, see Response to Comment 36-35. Regarding site access options and primary access, please see Master Response 1. Figure 2-7 illustrates an alternative Ferrini Ranch Road alignment and entrance kiosk location (analyzed under Alternative 3), which would move the road access farther west and the park entrance farther into the park grounds.

Regarding inclusionary housing, the project as proposed incorporates the units on-site. The DEIR analyzes the project as proposed.

Response to Comment 67-4

Comments focus on Alternative 4.

Comments regarding the grade-separated interchange design and support for “development nodes” in this alternative are noted for the record.

Comment Letter 68

From: William Tarp <wttarp@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 4:36 PM
To: Mack, David x5096
Cc: Holm, Carl P. x5103
Subject: Ferrini Ranch Subdivision

11/16/12

Mr. David Mack
Associate Planner
County of Monterey Planning Department
168 West Alisal, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: Ferrini Ranch Subdivision

Dear Mr. Mack,
I have reviewed the proposed plan for the homes to be built along Highway 68. The plan appears to me to be a good one inasmuch as homes will not be built on the floor of the Salinas Valley but rather in the hills. I like the fact that cattle ranching will continue on the Ferrini Ranch. This plan is a common sense approach to development, utilizing the open space and the retention of grazing land. The subdivision will benefit the community by giving Monterey County residents a choice in city vs. rural locations. I support this development.

Very truly yours,
Bill Tarp
PO Box 1251
Salinas, CA 93902

cc: Carl Holm

68-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #68 – TARP, BILL

Response to Comment 68-1

Comments are in support of the project.

Comment noted. No response is necessary.

Comment Letter 69

November 15, 2012

David Mack
Associate Planner, Monterey County

Below, please find my concerns about the DEIR for the Ferrini Ranch project (PLN040758).

Transportation

The DEIR states the payment of impact fees transforms the impact on the already unacceptable levels of service on highway 68 from “significant” to “minimal”. This can only be true if the impact fees directly result in projects to improve flow on the highway rather than window dressing described in the DEIR. Payment of impact fees will not enable sufficient improvements to mitigate the impact because there is not nearly enough money in that slush fund to address the existing problems. The project will further degrade levels of service that are already awful. Until and unless the county improves the highway 68 level of service to something resembling acceptable, it is irresponsible to add more traffic.

Use of Toro Park as an easement into the subdivision is a terrible use of public parkland. Adding yet another traffic light to highway 68 will further degrade the level of service on that highway.

Ground Water

This project will accelerate the overdraft of, and the intrusion of seawater into the Salinas Groundwater Basin. Contrary to the DEIR assertion, the SVWP has not yet been shown to have made substantive progress toward hydrologically balancing the Salinas Groundwater Basin. The DEIR implies a buildout of 447 units at the site was part of the SVWP projections, yet no evidence of this is given. Major developments such as this one should not be considered until the SVWP has proven effective. Until then, the impact of the development should be considered to be significant.

The western section of the project, (having the vast majority of the building) intersects with the Toro area currently experiencing substantial overdraft of their aquifers. The development will degrade ground water recharge in that area, further accelerating overdraft of the aquifer in the Toro area.

Scenic Viewshed

The development is in a critical scenic viewshed and, by ordinance, should not be permitted. Visibility from a highway is not a suitable metric. The viewshed is for the benefit of all, including hikers and joggers on trails overlooking the area. Building berms to hide houses is not a solution. No development should be permitted in critical viewsheds.

Sincerely,
Mike Thompson
San Benancio Canyon

69-1

RESPONSE TO LETTER #69 – THOMPSON, MIKE

Response to Comment 69-1

Comments express concerns regarding additional traffic on Highway 68, impacts to public parkland, groundwater resources and recharge, and critical scenic viewshed.

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic and viewsheds, Response to Comment 3-1 regarding impacts to Toro County Park, and Master Response 2 regarding groundwater. See Response to Comment 63-5 regarding groundwater recharge.