

EXHIBIT I

COMMENT LETTERS

(Received since October 29, 2014 meeting)

Novo, Mike x5192

From: Hancock, Denise 796-3077
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 8:11 AM
To: Allen, Carol x5178; Novo, Mike x5192
Subject: FW: For Planning Commission-Ferrini Ranch development

Denise Hancock, Board Clerk
Monterey County
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
168 W. Alisal St., 1st Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
831-755-5066
<http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/cob/>

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

From: Nora Shen [<mailto:whats.cooking@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, November 01, 2014 6:49 AM
To: 112-Clerk of the Board Everyone
Subject: For Planning Commission-Ferrini Ranch development

Hi,
This e-mail is for the Planning Commission. I would like to voice my opinion on the Ferrini Development that is currently being considered. As a resident of the Monterey Peninsula, I have found that the quality of life here has diminished with our water shortage. Yards have dried up, cars have gone unwashed, showers are timed, laundry and dishwashing are minimized...We have heard of people in the area with private wells that have run dry...they are reduced to going to town to shower, going to the grocery store to buy water for drinking, cooking, dishwashing, flushing toilets...The concern that the water problem will further with the lack of rain is only compounded by considerations of more development. Water is already in short supply...PLEASE do not stretch the existing water supply...
Thank you for your consideration...
~ A Concerned Resident of Monterey...~

Mack, David x5096

From: noble.hill@att.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Mack, David x5096
Subject: Separate issues with Ferrini project

October 28, 2014

Mr. Mack
Monterey County Planning Division
RE: Ferrini Ranch

Several issues come into play with regard to Ferrini Ranch and the request to widen and lengthen Scenic Highway 68.

The Scenic Highway designation makes the development of property very difficult for those who own land abutting to the Highway. Since the builder and his family have owned the land for decades, this cannot be unknown to them. The local government agreed to certain obligations and protections when accepting the Scenic Highway designation. I am certainly not the expert for building or water rights but more interested in the lengthening and widening of Scenic Highway 68.

Scenic Highway 68 was designated as such in June of 1968. In reading the history, there is reference to a past discussion of a freeway between Monterey and Salinas. Mention is made of the decision to bypass the unincorporated village of Toro Park. Toro Park homes were built from about 1964, completing around 1972, partially completed by June of 1968. I believe the decision to leave the open area of the State and County land parallel to Highway 68 was to protect the "village" acting as a buffer from road noise and traffic and to allow the scenery and beauty of Highway 68 to continue until such time as designated Scenic Highway 68 ends, I believe at the Salinas River.

Most residents and locals off Highway 68 would not object to lovely homes on large scenic lots as neighbors (if the law allows the building and the water is available) however the cost of the builders request to increase the lanes of traffic (and usually include shoulders, medians, turn lanes) in addition to a traffic signal benefit only the builder and his ability to allow all the heavy equipment needed for building to access the site, later to be used by the new residents. Have you considered the years and cost with a traffic back up for years with the road widening and then the Ferrini construction traffic all on the road the same time as commuters and school traffic.

The builder's representatives were very misleading regarding peak times, traffic noise and commuter savings when they averaged it over a 24 hour period to make the numbers palatable. They may have done the work for the county as they have shown the mile and a half (of lengthening and widening) that would be devastating to numerous homeowners in Toro Park Estates do not move traffic at any faster pace. The new road he suggests in Toro would drag the interior traffic even further into the neighborhood, to areas that have not had that impact in the past. Torero as it is now, does allow traffic to merge onto Highway 68 westbound. The slow moving commuters westbound have always been gracious about allowing those existing Torero the right turn onto Highway 68.

If the current berms need to be moved and modified to accommodate four lanes, even more homeowners will be affected. Without the natural light and views and with potentially 6 lanes of traffic behind them, the homes will experience a drop in value and languish on the market. When neighborhood comps are used, there would be a drop in the price per square foot for all of Toro Park Estates homes. The developer will make his money and leave the area, certainly leaving Toro Park Estates worse for his dream and fortune.

Traffic lights by their very nature create backlog. They are there to stop traffic. The merge still necessary, moved a mile and a half further down, right before the blind curve leading to the breakfast traffic of the Toro Café. Traffic is still

impacted by lights at San Benancio, Corral, and the grade, etc. None of those intersections affect a huge neighborhood as does the proposal would for Toro Park Estates.

When you read the following:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_Scenic_Highway_System_\(California\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_Scenic_Highway_System_(California)) first paragraph and then the portion specific to Highway 68: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_State_Route_68, questions regarding earthmoving as applied to berms and does the unincorporated village of Toro Park in fact have some protection under the Scenic Highway designation?

For many of us the issue is the negative impact of widening the highway and creating berms for a mile and a half along an established, respected older neighborhood. Every day, at all times of the day, people are out enjoying the use of the open space that you would consider using for a multi-lane highway. Previous decisions have been to bypass (thereby protecting) the area around Toro Village.

The traffic issues are from about 7:00 am to 9:00 am Monday – Friday, when schools are in session. There is no savings in County funds, commuter times, etc. for the massive project of the mile and a half lengthening and widening.

Michelle Hill

noble.hill@att.net

22701 Manolete Drive

Corral de Tierra, CA