Montecito Ranch

APPENDIX A

NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) AND COMMENTS ON THE NOP

for the

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SP01-001; TM 5250RPL[6]; P04-045;

LOG NO. 01-09-013; SCH NO. 2002021132

May 2008

GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

SAN MARCOS OFFICE
338 VIA VERA CRUZ - SUITE 201
SAN MARCOS, CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST. - SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON, CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

February 28, 2002

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the following projects. The Department is seeking public and agency input on the scope and content of the environmental information to be contained in the Environmental Impact Report. A Notice of Preparation document, which contains a description of the probable environmental effects of the project, can be reviewed at the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU), Project Processing Counter, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California 92123 and at the public libraries listed below. Comments on the Notice of Preparation document must be sent to the DPLU address listed above and should reference the project number and name.

SP 01-001; TM 5250; Log No. 01-09-013; MONTECITO RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN. The project proposes a residential community including 358 single-family residences on lots ranging from a minimum of two acres to more than four acres, concentrated on level and gently sloping portions of the site and covering 260 acres of the 935-acre site. The design of Montecito Ranch will provide open space and recreational opportunities including 561 acres of open space, a 6.8-acre historical park designed around the Montecito Ranch House, a 33-acre passive community park and a 12-acre school site. The project is located north of the Montecito Way/El Paso Street intersection and south of State Route 78 between Weekend Villa Road and Indian Oaks Road within the community of Ramona in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 279-071-26; 279-072-01-18; 279-072-27-34; 270-072-27-34; 279-093-10, 37, 38; 280-010-03, 08, 09; 280-030-04-06, 10, 15, 24, 25; 280-031-01-06. Comments on this Notice of Preparation document must be received no later than March 29, 2002 at 4:00 p.m. (a 30 day public review period). This Notice of Preparation can also be reviewed at the Ramona Branch Library, located at 1406 Montecito Road, Ramona, CA 92065. For additional information, please contact Jason Giffen at (858) 694-3720 or by e-mail at Jason.Giffen@sdcounty.ca.gov.

ND0202\0109013-NOT;tf

GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

SAN MARCOS OFFICE
338 VIA VERA CRUZ - SUITE 201
SAN MARCOS, CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST. - SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON, CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

NOTICE OF PREPARATION DOCUMENTATION

DATE: February 28, 2002

PROJECT NAME: Montecito Ranch

PROJECT NUMBER(S): SP 01-001; TM 5250

PROJECT APPLICANT: Montecito Properties, LLC
402 West Broadway, Suite 2175
San Diego, California 92101

ENV. REVIEW NUMBER: Log No. 01-09-013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Montecito Ranch project proposes a residential community including 358 single-family residential homes sites on lots ranging from a minimum of two acres to more than four acres, concentrated on level and gently sloping portions of the site and covering 260 acres of the 935-acre site. The design of Montecito Ranch will provide open space and recreational opportunities including 561 acres of open space, a 6.8-acre historical park designed around the Montecito Ranch House, a 33-acre passive community park and a 12-acre school site. The project table below summarizes the acreage and percentage of the site occupied by each land use.

Project Summary

Land Use	Acreage	Percent (%)	Dwelling Unit Per Acre du/ac	Dwelling Units
Residential Development				
Single Family Lots*	260	27.8	0.38	358
Sub Total	260	27.8	0.38	358
Open Space Preservation				
Open Space	561.6	60.1		
Passive Community Park	33	3.5		
Historical Site	6.8	0.7%		
Sub Total	601.4	64.3		
Institutional				
Elementary School	12.3	1.3		
Sub Total	12.3	1.3		
Street Dedication				
Circulation and Neighborhoods	61.3	6.6		
Sub Total	61.3	6.6		
TOTAL	935	100%	0.38	.038

*Represents residential lot acreage less open space easement.

The 561 acres of open space intends to protect sensitive landforms, steep slopes, and a range of sensitive habitats. The historical park is designed around the Montecito Ranch House. The Montecito Ranch House is a historic structure that exists on the project site and is designated as a Resource Conservation Area (RCA) for its historic value. The structure is listed in the Ramona Community Plan as a Historic Preservation Area. The Ranch House will be dedicated to the community to be preserved on-site for its historic value. Expected uses within the site will include a meeting place. The 33-acre passive community park will contain passive uses such as nature observation, picnicking, horseshoes, and exercise stations, and staging area. The park will serve both Montecito Ranch residents and the Ramona community in general. The 12-acre school site will support an elementary school to be dedicated to the Ramona Unified School District. Equestrian and pedestrian trails will traverse the property providing connection to the County's planned Regional Trail System. Trails will be constructed using decomposed granite and will be opened to the public for equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle use.

The project proposes four (4) planning areas in order to implement the objectives set forth for Montecito Ranch. These planning areas will accommodate the project's 358 single-family residential home sites and associated infrastructure. The following table details the proposed uses by planning area.

Uses by Planning Area

Planning Area	Number of Lots	Residential Development Area (acres)	Street Dedication (acres)	Open Space Preservation (acres)	Historical Site (acres)	Park (acres)	School Site (acres)	Total Planning Area Acreage
Planning Area 1	84	99.4	13.8	108.4	6.8			228.4
Planning Area 2	56	34.0	9.3	107.2				105.5
Planning Area 3	92	70.7	16.9	155.4			12.3	255.3
Planning Area 4	126	55.9	21.3	190.6		33.0		300.8
TOTAL	358	260	61.3	561.6	6.8	33	12.3	935

Regional access to the project site will be achieved via State Routes 67 and 78. Local roadways providing access to the project vicinity include Montecito Way, Ash Street and Cedar Street. Local and residential streets will be constructed as public roadways with standard rights-of-way provided. All local and residential streets will consist of a pavement width of twenty-eight feet. Parallel on-street parking shall be permitted on all public streets, except Montecito Ranch Road and Montecito Way.

The Circulation Element of the Ramona Community Plan designates SA-603 as a select arterial that will traverse the property from the southwestern portion of the project site to the east at Ash Street. SA-603, known as Montecito Ranch Road in the project proposal, will consist of a 98-foot right-of-way with a pavement width of 20 feet in each direction, separated by a 14-foot median and restricted lot access. The 20-foot travel ways are to be constructed as a two-lane roadway with left turn lanes where necessary. A 10-foot wide parkway will be provided on the south side of the roadway. On the north side, an 8-foot wide Regional Trail within a 20-foot wide landscape parkway will be constructed.

Montecito Way will provide access to the southern portion of the site. Montecito Way as it extends on-site will provide alignment of Select Arterial (SA) 330, a County Circulation Element roadway. Montecito Way will contain 84-foot right-of-way with 20-foot travel ways to be constructed as a two-lane roadway. A 10-foot wide parkway will be provided on the east side of the roadway and a 20-foot wide parkway will be provided on the west side. On the west, a 20-foot wide parkway will accommodate an eight-foot wide decomposed granite trail to accommodate horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.

Other proposed circulation for the project site includes improving Ash Street to a 40-foot paving width within a 60-foot right-of-way between the eastern boundary of the project and SR-78. Also, within the project boundaries local and residential streets will be constructed as public roadways with standard right-of-way.

Architecturally, the project proposes to reflect the rural character of Ramona by using building materials, roofing tiles, color palettes, and façade treatments that reflect rural

style development. Landscaping is proposed which will emphasize the natural surroundings and landforms in residential areas. Native vegetation will be emphasized throughout the project. Ornamental plants will be used that are compatible with the native plants existing on-site and drought tolerant planting would be encouraged throughout the project. Any fencing and signage will be constructed using natural materials.

Drainage at the project site flows in a northeasterly and southwesterly direction. The project intends to convey runoff into the existing drainage courses, where feasible, by directing runoff from natural channels to areas within the development where it will be collected and released into the natural drainage. Where the existing on-site creek bed intersects with development, reinforced concrete boxes (RCB) with wing walls and/or reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) culverts will be used.

The project is currently outside of the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) service boundary. However, facilities are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district. Water service to the project is expected to come from the RMWD Zone 1820. Average day water demand for the project at buildout is expected to be 211,200 gallons per day. The project proposes to construct improvements to the existing RMWD water system including the installation of transmission piping off-site to the existing 1820 Zone. Several lots on the western side of the project are too low to be served directly from the 1820 Zone because static pressures would exceed 150 pounds per square inch (psi). The project proposes to construct a pressure reducing station in line with the 1820 Zone system to provide service to these lots.

Sewer service will be provided to the project from the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) utilizing the Santa Maria Water Treatment Plant (WTP) for treatment of wastewater. Montecito Ranch will generate approximately 73,000 gallons of sewage per day at build-out. Capacity is available at the Santa Maria WTP to serve the project. In order to be served by the RMWD and utilize the Santa Maria WTP for treatment of wastewater, an off-site gravity sewer line will need to be constructed from the project boundary to the interceptor line located along Santa Maria Creek. Wastewater will be conveyed by means of a 10-inch gravity sewer line south along Montecito Way, east on Montecito Road, and south on Kalbaugh Street to an existing manhole located near the Santa Maria Creek. This line will connect with the existing Santa Maria Interceptor just above the Santa Maria WTP. All wastewater from Montecito Ranch will be collected at the southwest corner of the project. Two on-site lift stations will be required on the eastern portion of the project site to pump wastewater to the west into the gravity sewer collection system and the western portion of the project drains by gravity to the southwest corner of the site.

The project proposes to grade 374 acres with approximately 2,500,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. The grading operations will be balanced on site, with no need for export or import of soil. The maximum cut slope ratio will be 1.5:1 with a height of 60 feet and the maximum fill slope ratio will be 2:1 with a maximum height of 60 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project is located within the Ramona Planning Group area approximately twenty miles northeast of the City of San Diego at 1080 Montecito Way. The project is located approximately 1 one-quarter mile north of the town center of Ramona within the County of San Diego. The approximately 935-acre project area has a southern boundary at the Montecito Way/El Paso Street intersection and is bounded by State Route 78 between Weekend Villa Road and Indian Oaks Road to the north. The project area includes the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 279-071-26; 279-072-01-18; 279-072-27-34; 270-072-27-34; 279-093-10, 37, 38; 280-010-03, 08, 09; 280-030-04-06, 10, 15, 24, 25; 280-031-01-06. Please refer to the regional location map and the project location map for more information on the site's location.

PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:

The probable environmental effects associated with the project are detailed in the attached Environmental Initial Study. All questions answered "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" will be analyzed further in the Environmental Impact Report. All questions answered "Less than Significant Impact" or "Not Applicable" will not be analyzed further in the Environmental Impact Report.

The following is a summary of the subject areas to be analyzed in the EIR and the particular issues of concern:

Land Use and Planning (includes Community Character)
The project proposes a large-scale residential project, which includes 358 single-family residences, a historical park, a passive community park a elementary school site, open space, and associated infrastructure for roads, sewer and water service. As proposed the project may have potential conflicts with Ramona's Community Plan, Ramona's community character, lot design requirements, or environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies. Conformance with the Ramona Community Plan must be demonstrated in the context of the Land Use and Community Character technical study and EIR, particularly relating to the minimum parcel size. Minimum parcel size will be guided to some extent by the project's slope constraints and the project's agricultural requirements listed under Conditions 40, 41, and 42 of the Ramona Community Plan. Due to the scale of the project the Land Use and Community Character technical study and EIR must address whether the character of the community of Ramona or the

physical arrangement to existing or planned land uses are affected by this project. Also, §81.401 of the Subdivision Ordinance sets forth design requirements for all major subdivisions. This project proposed numerous waivers of these requirements particularly the 3:1 depth to width ratio. The Land Use and Community Character technical study and EIR must address the proposed waivers and the reason why the waivers should be granted.

Agriculture Resources
The project site was previously cultivated and contains 103 acres of prime agricultural soils. Implementation of the proposal will result in converting portions of the Montecito Ranch site that formerly supported agricultural pursuits and grazing land to residential uses and open space. Also, development of the project site may result in a potentially significant conversion of lands supporting prime agricultural soils to a non-agricultural use. Moreover, the project may not be compatible with the Ramona Community Plan, Agricultural Policies, Conditions 40, 41, and 42. As a result, these issues must be addressed in the context of the Agricultural technical study and the EIR and the significance of impacts to agriculture resources must be evaluated.

Population and Housing
The proposed project involves substantial extension of water and sewer lines to the project site and the project proposes to develop the northern Ramona bypass through the project site. Therefore, the project may potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly, creating a potentially significant impact. As a result, the associated growth inducing impacts from expanded sewer facilities, water facilities and roadways must be evaluated in the Growth Inducement technical study and the EIR.

Geological Issues
The project site supports numerous soils that severe erodibility potential and high shrink-swell behavior. Based on the a significant amount of grading, improvements and landform modification proposed by the project there are potentially significant impacts related to erodibility and unstable soil conditions that must be addressed. Even though, the project is required to comply with the Grading Ordinance Requirements §87.403, §87.410, §87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and §87.417 (PLANTING) of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations compliance with these regulations must be addressed in the context of the EIR. Additionally, the project site supports many rock outcroppings and although none of these rock outcroppings were identified as unique geological features on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan, some of these outcroppings may be considered either scientifically or visually significant. As a result, the potential impacts to any significant geological resources must be discussed in the context of the EIR and supporting technical studies as appropriate.

Water Resources
The proposal involves significant amounts of grading and may create a potentially adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate and amount of runoff. Therefore, the potentially adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate and amount of runoff must be discussed in the context of a technical study for Drainage and Flooding (hydrology and hydraulic study) and the EIR. Also, the development will result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces (roofs, driveways, patios, sidewalks, and roads) that reduces the natural purification process of stormwater, and introduction of potential pollutant sources (auto emissions, leaks, drips and maintenance wastes, pet wastes, household pesticides, fertilizers, and hazardous materials, and litter). Therefore, all potentially significant adverse effects on surface water quality, specifically relating to stormwater must be addressed in the context of the EIR and technical study for stormwater. Finally, the demand on the local imported water system cannot be determined and must be further discussed in the context of the EIR. The EIR must clearly define whether the RMWD can serve the project and whether the project will significantly increase the demand on the local imported water system.

Air Quality
The project may generate at least 4,500 average daily trips (ADT) from the proposed residential uses, historical park, passive park, and school, as well as additional through traffic along Montecito Ranch Road. Therefore, vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality impact. As a result, the project's potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation must be discussed in the Air Quality technical study and the EIR.

Transportation/Circulation
Development of the project will result in at least 4,500 ADT. These trips will utilize Montecito Ranch Road (SA-603), which will consist of a 98-foot right-of-way, Montecito Way (SA 330), which will contain a 84-foot right-of-way, and Ash Street and Cedar Street. These proposed roads will serve the project site and create the northern Ramona bypass. The intent of the northern Ramona bypass to will direct traffic away from the center of Ramona. A Traffic technical study will be completed to assess the potential impacts to traffic circulation, safety and intersectional turning movements on all affected roadways. Particular concern will be focused on the on-site and off-site improvements required to complete Montecito Ranch Road and the intersectional improvements and site distance issues at the Montecito Ranch Road, Montecito Way, Ash Street and Cedar Street. All these issues must be addressed in the Traffic technical study and the EIR.

Biological Resources
The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. The site

supports the following sensitive habitat: Diegan coastal sage scrub; southern mixed chaparral; Engelmann oak woodland; southern coast live oak riparian forest; riparian scrub; wetlands; freshwater seep; vernal pools; and non-native grassland. To date some protocol surveys have been initiated and some have been completed. Recent surveys for the California gnatcatchers revealed that approximately 20 California gnatcatchers reside on the property. The California gnatcatchers were distributed into four family groups and two pair. Impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species and sensitive habitats must be minimized and often avoided entirely. In order to evaluate these impacts a Biological Resources technical study must be completed and any impacts to species or habitats must be addressed in the study and the EIR. Also, the study and EIR must address compliance with County's Resource Protection Ordinance, the California Department of Fish and Game's §1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement and Natural Communities Conservation Plan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife's Endangered Species Act, and Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit requirement as applicable.

Hazards
The project may result in exposing people or property to fire or flooding hazards. The project is located in area with a hazardous wildland fire area and as such a fire management plan must be developed to ensure future residents and structures are adequately protected from fire hazards. To address fire hazards a 150-foot fuel management zone is proposed. The details of the fuel management zone and efficacy of that zone must be discussed in the context of the EIR. In regard to flooding the Drainage and Flooding technical study and EIR must ensure that runoff quantities and proposed drainage facility capacity can accommodate potential flood hazards and that people and property will not be exposed to significant flood events.

Noise
The proposal may generate or expose people to potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations). Potentially significant adverse noise levels may be generated adjacent to the Circulation Element road designated in the Ramona Community Plan as SA-603 (Montecito Ranch Road); the extension of Montecito Way; Cedar Street; the proposed elementary school and other facilities on-site and off-site. To determine the intensity of potential noise impacts and conformance to County and State Noise Standards, namely, San Diego County Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) a Noise technical study must be completed for the project and discussed in the EIR.

Public Services
The proposed project creates the need for altered services. To obtain service from the Ramona Fire Protection District a fire management plan must be developed to ensure future residents and structures are adequately protected from hazardous wildland fires. Additionally, it must be demonstrated the Ramona Fire Protection District can adequately service to the project. To receive water and sewer service from the RMWD

infrastructure improvements will be required on-site and off-site. Receiving adequate service is dependent upon these infrastructure improvements, namely to the RMWD Zone 1820 for water and to Santa Maria WTP for sewer, and receiving approval from Local Agency Formation Commission to extent the RMWD latent powers. Finally, the project is located entirely within the Ramona Unified School District and it is eligible for service. However, the project will result in overcrowding at district facilities and as a result fees will be levied in accordance with state law prior to the issuance of building permits. The Public Services technical study and EIR must address any altered public services and any potentially significant impacts to public services.

Utilities and Services
The proposal may result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to utilities. To receive water and sewer service from the RMWD infrastructure improvements will be required on-site and off-site. Receiving adequate service is dependent upon these infrastructure improvements, namely to the RMWD Zone 1820 for water and to Santa Maria WTP for sewer, and receiving approval from Local Agency Formation Commission to extent the RMWD latent powers. The Public Services technical study and EIR must address any potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to utilities.

Aesthetics (includes Landform Modification)
The project is located adjacent to Highway 78, which is a Second Priority Scenic Highway. As a result, the project has the potential to result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. The site also supports steep slopes and existing viewsheds, which if developed may not be in conformance with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance or may impact the existing viewshed. Major aesthetics issues that must be discussed in the technical study include landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), impacts to an scenic vista or highway, or any other negative aesthetic effect.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources
The development may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Previous archeological reconnaissance and surveys have been completed on the Montecito Ranch site. In January 1992, archaeological reconnaissance of Montecito Ranch was performed Gallegos and Associates with a subsequent reconnaissance completed by Brian F. Mooney Associates in 1995. The reconnaissance(s) included a record search that indicated that 39 cultural sites have been recorded on the project site. Additionally, 15 archaeological sites were determined to be significant. In order to adequately evaluate the archaeological sites the completed archaeological survey(s) must be submitted and addressed in the context of the EIR.

Also, the Montecito Ranch House is designated as a Historic Preservation Area in the Ramona community Plan and as a Resource Conservation Area (RCA) in the County General Plan. The Ranch House is planned to for on-site preservation. Therefore, the Montecito Ranch House must have a completed Historical Preservation Plan and must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

Mandatory Findings of Significance
As detailed in the section of the Initial Study the project may cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and may threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. The project may reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and may eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project may create incremental impacts that may be cumulatively considerable or may not satisfy long-term environmental goals. Therefore, an EIR is required to discuss all the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Attachments:

- Project Regional Location Map
- Project Detailed Location Map
- Plot Plan Exhibit
- Environmental Initial Study

JG:tf

ND0202\0109013-NOP

GARY L. PRYOR
DIRECTOR
(858) 694-2962

County of San Diego

SAN MARCOS OFFICE
338 VIA VERA CRUZ - SUITE 201
SAN MARCOS, CA 92069-2620
(760) 471-0730

EL CAJON OFFICE
200 EAST MAIN ST. - SIXTH FLOOR
EL CAJON, CA 92020-3912
(619) 441-4030

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

February 28, 2002

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

   SP 01-001; TM 5250; Log No. 01-09-013; Montecito Ranch Specific Plan

2. Description of Project:

   The Montecito Ranch project proposes a residential community including 358 single-family residential homes sites on lots ranging from a minimum of two acres to more than four acres, concentrated on level and gently sloping portions of the site and covering 260 acres of the 935-acre site. The design of Montecito Ranch will provide open space and recreational opportunities including 561 acres of open space, a 6.8-acre historical park designed around the Montecito Ranch House, a 33-acre passive community park and a 12-acre school site. The project table below summarizes the acreage and percentage of the site occupied by each land use.

Project Summary

Land Use	Acreage	Percent (%)	Dwelling Unit Per Acre du/ac	Dwelling Units
Residential Development				
Single Family Lots*	260	27.8	0.38	358
Sub Total	**260**	**27.8**	**0.38**	**358**
Open Space Preservation				
Open Space	561.6	60.1		
Passive Community Park	33	3.5		
Historical Site	6.8	0.7%		
Sub Total	**601.4**	**64.3**		
Institutional				
Elementary School	12.3	1.3		
Sub Total	**12.3**	**1.3**		
Street Dedication				
Circulation and Neighborhoods	61.3	6.6		
Sub Total	**61.3**	**6.6**		
TOTAL	**935**	**100%**	**0.38**	**.038**

*Represents residential lot acreage less open space easement.

The 561 acres of open space intends to protect sensitive landforms, steep slopes, and a range of sensitive habitats. The historical park is designed around the Montecito Ranch House. The Montecito Ranch House is a historic structure that exists on the project site and is designated as a Resource Conservation Area (RCA) for its historic value. The structure is listed in the Ramona Community Plan as a Historic Preservation Area. The Ranch House will be dedicated to the community to be preserved on-site for its historic value. Expected uses within the site will include a meeting place. The 33-acre passive community park will contain passive uses such as nature observation, picnicking, horseshoes, and exercise stations, and staging area. The park will serve both Montecito Ranch residents and the Ramona community in general. The 12-acre school site will support an elementary school to be dedicated to the Ramona Unified School District. Equestrian and pedestrian trails will traverse the property providing connection to the County's planned Regional Trail System. Trails will be constructed using decomposed granite and will be opened to the public for equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle use.

The project proposes four (4) planning areas in order to implement the objectives set forth for Montecito Ranch. These planning areas will accommodate the project's 358 single-family residential home sites and associated infrastructure. The following table details the proposed uses by planning area.

Uses by Planning Area

Planning Area	Number of Lots	Residential Development Area	Street Dedication	Open Space Preservation	Historical Site	Park	School Site	Total Planning Area Acreage
Planning Area 1	84	99.4	13.8	108.4	6.8			228.4
Planning Area 2	56	34.0	9.3	107.2				105.5
Planning Area 3	92	70.7	16.9	155.4			12.3	255.3
Planning Area 4	126	55.9	21.3	190.6		33.0		300.8
TOTAL	358	260	61.3	561.6	6.8	33	12.3	935

Regional access to the project site will be achieved via State Routes 67 and 78. Local roadways providing access to the project vicinity include Montecito Way, Ash Street and Cedar Street. Local and residential streets will be constructed as public roadways with standard rights-of-way provided. All local and residential streets will consist of a pavement width of twenty-eight feet. Parallel on-street parking shall be permitted on all public streets, except Montecito Ranch Road and Montecito Way.

The Circulation Element of the Ramona Community Plan designates SA-603 as a select arterial that will traverse the property from the southwestern portion of the project site to the east at Ash Street. SA-603, known as Montecito Ranch Road in the project proposal, will consist of a 98-foot right-of-way with a pavement width of 20 feet in each direction, separated by a 14-foot median and restricted lot access. The 20-foot travel ways are to be constructed as a two-lane roadway with left turn lanes where necessary. A 10-foot wide parkway will be provided on the south side of the roadway. On the north side, an 8-foot wide Regional Trail within a 20-foot wide landscape parkway will be constructed.

Montecito Way will provide access to the southern portion of the site. Montecito Way as it extends on-site will provide alignment of Select Arterial (SA) 330, a County Circulation Element roadway. Montecito Way will contain 84-foot right-of-way with 20-foot travel ways to be constructed as a two-lane roadway. A 10-foot wide parkway will be provided on the east side of the roadway and a 20-foot wide parkway will be provided on the west side. On the west, a 20-foot wide parkway will accommodate an eight-foot wide decomposed granite trail to accommodate horses, pedestrians and bicyclists.

Other proposed circulation for the project site includes improving Ash Street to a 40-foot paving width within a 60-foot right-of-way between the eastern boundary of the project and SR-78. Also, within the project boundaries local and residential streets will be constructed as public roadways with standard right-of-way.

Architecturally, the project proposes to reflect the rural character of Ramona by using building materials, roofing tiles, color palettes, and façade treatments that reflect rural style development. Landscaping is proposed which will emphasize the natural surroundings and landforms in residential areas. Native vegetation will be emphasized throughout the project. Ornamental plants will be used that are compatible with the native plants existing on site and drought tolerant planting would be encouraged throughout the project. Any fencing and signage will be constructed using natural materials.

Drainage at the project site flows in a northeasterly and southwesterly direction. The project intends to convey runoff into the existing drainage courses, where feasible by directing runoff from natural channels to areas within the development where it will be collected and released into the natural drainage. Where the existing on-site creek bed intersects with development, reinforced concrete boxes (RCB) with wing walls and/or reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) culverts will be used.

The project is currently outside of the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) service boundary. However, facilities are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district. Water service to the project is expected to come from the RMWD Zone 1820. Average day water demand for the project at buildout is expected to be 211,200 gallons per day. The project proposes to construct improvements to the existing RMWD water system including the installation of transmission piping off-site to the existing 1820 Zone. Several lots on the western side of the project are too low to be served directly from the 1820 Zone because static pressures would exceed 150 pounds per square inch (psi). The project proposes to construct a pressure reducing station in line with the 1820 Zone system to provide service to these lots.

Sewer service will be provided to the project from the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) utilizing the Santa Maria Water Treatment Plant (WTP) for treatment of wastewater. Montecito Ranch will generate approximately 73,000 gallons of sewage per day at buildout. Capacity is available at the Santa Maria WTP to serve the project. In order to be served by the RMWD and utilize the Santa Maria WTP for treatment of wastewater, an off-site gravity sewer line will need to be constructed from the project boundary to the interceptor line located along Santa Maria Creek. Wastewater will be conveyed by means of a 10-inch gravity sewer line south along Montecito Way, east on Montecito Road, and south on Kalbaugh Street to an existing manhole located near the Santa Maria Creek. This line will connect with the existing Santa Maria Interceptor just above the Santa Maria WTP. All wastewater from Montecito Ranch will be collected at the southwest corner of the project. Two on-site lift stations will be required on the eastern portion of the project site to pump wastewater to the west into the gravity sewer collection system and the western portion of the project drains by gravity to the southwest corner of the site.

The project proposes to grade 374 acres with approximately 2,500,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. The grading operations will be balanced on site, with no need for export or import of soil. The maximum cut slope ratio will be 1.5:1 with a height of 60 feet and the maximum fill slope ratio will be 2:1 with a maximum height of 60 feet.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Montecito Properties, LLC
402 West Broadway, Suite 2175
San Diego, CA 92101

4. Project Location:

The project is located within the Ramona Planning Group area approximately 20 miles northeast of the City of San Diego at 1080 Montecito Way. The project is located approximately 1 one-quarter mile north of the town center of Ramona within the County of San Diego. The approximately 935-acre project area has a southern boundary at the Montecito Way/El Paso Street intersection and is bounded by State Route 78 between Weekend Villa Road and Indian Oaks Road to the north. The project area includes the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 279-071-26; 279-072-01-18; 279-072-27-34; 270-072-27-34; 279-093-10, 37, 38; 280-010-03, 08, 09; 280-030-04-06, 10, 15, 24, 25; 280-031-01-06.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1152, Grid D/3

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The 935-acre project site is located on undeveloped land with the exception of the Montecito Ranch House that is the only residence on the site. The project is located in the broad Santa Maria Valley area of Ramona that is characterized by its rural character and pastureland for cattle grazing. Scattered within the valley are cultivated areas and residential uses. The site is surrounded by rural residential and agricultural uses. The current zone surrounding the project site is a Limited Agricultural Use Regulation (A70) except for a portion of the southern southwestern boundary that is zoned as a Specific Planning Area designation (S88 - Davis Specific Plan Area).

The Ramona Airport (a facility used for firefighting aircraft and general aviation) is located approximately one-third mile south of the southernmost boundary of the project site, while runways at the airport are situated over one-half mile south of the southern boundary of the project site.

Adjoining the project site on the northwest is property owned by the Lemurian Fellowship that has been developed with a church and other facilities related to Fellowship operations.

The undeveloped 1,027-acre Davis Specific Plan Area adjoins the project site on the south and west. The Ramona Community Plan designates the site for development of 171 single-family units on minimum three-acre lots with industrial uses on the lands adjacent to the Ramona Airport.

To the southeast and north, land remains vacant or has been developed with residential uses on large lots in accordance with the Ramona Community Plan.

State Route 78 borders the project site to the north. Access to the site exists via Montecito Way, Ash Street and Cedar Street, all of which currently terminate at the project boundary.

Several native and non-native habitats exist on Montecito Ranch including: Diegan coastal sage scrub; southern mixed chaparral; Engelmann oak woodland; southern coast live oak riparian forest; riparian scrub; wetlands; freshwater seep; vernal pools; non-native grassland; eucalyptus woodland; extensive agriculture and disturbed habitat. Nearly all of the property with slopes of less than 15 percent (approximately 608 acres) have been altered by cattle grazing, prior farming, or other disturbances. These areas support non-native grasslands, pasture or introduced plantings. Vernal pools have been identified within the extreme southwestern portion of the property within the disturbed pastureland.

Topographically, the project is characterized by a broad valley in the central portion of the site with gently sloping terrain to the north. Elevations vary from approximately 1,768 feet above mean sea level (MSL) along the northern property boundary to approximately 1,270 above MSL within the southwestern portion of the property. Approximately 16 percent of the site, or 12 acres contains slopes of 25 percent or more.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Ramona Community Plan
Land Use Designation:	Specific Planning Area, (21)
Density:	0.5 du – maximum 417 dwelling units within project area per the Ramona Community Plan

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	Specific Plan Area (S88) Limited Agriculture (A70) – a small two-acre portion in the northwest area of the site
Density:	0.5 du / 1 acre in S88 zone (2 acre minimum lot size) 0.25 du / 4 acre(s) in A70 zone
Special Area Regulation:	Scenic (S) - portion

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Land Use and Planning (includes Community Character)
Agriculture Resources
Population and Housing
Geological Issues
Water Resources
Air Quality
Transportation/Circulation
Biological Resources
Hazards
Noise
Public Services
Utilities and Services
Aesthetics (includes Landform Modification)
Cultural and Paleontological Resources
Mandatory Findings of Significance

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Jason Giffen, Environmental Analyst (858) 694-3720

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed project:

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Clearing and Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Execution of Indefinite Offer to Dedicate Right-of-Way	County of San Diego
Streambed Alteration Agreement	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Endangered Species Act - Section 7 or 10a	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Clean Water Act - Section 404 Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Highway Encroachment Permit	CalTrans
Clean Water Act	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Annexation to Ramona Municipal Water District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)
Air Quality Permit	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

    None

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

    Helix Environmental Planning, Inc.
    William Stocks, Project Manager/Planner, DPLU
    Jason Giffen, Project Environmental Analyst, DPLU
    Dawn Dickman, Project Biologist, DPLU
    Jennifer Campos, Environmental Analyst, DPLU
    Kenneth Brazell, Project Manager, DPW

14. Initial Study Determination:

    On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant effect on the environment. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.

JASON GIFFEN, Project Environmental Analyst
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Resource Planning

Date: February 28, 2002

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: February 28, 2002

PROJECT NAME: Montecito Ranch Specific Plan

PROJECT NUMBER(S): SP 01-001; TM 5250; Log No. 01-09-013

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes. "Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

This project proposes to implement the provisions of the Montecito Rancho Specific Plan Area as set forth in the Ramona Community Plan. The specific plan covers 935 acres. Proposed uses include:

- 358 single detached residential lots with a minimum lot size of 2 acres.
- Natural Open Space Areas
- Passive Community Park
- Historic Site (Montecito Ranch House)
- Elementary School

Planning/Design Issues

A. General Plan

(1) Regional Land Use Element

The project site is subject to the Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category. The EDA combines agricultural and low-density residential uses. Included in the category are those areas outside the Urban Limit Line but within the boundaries of the County Water Authority. Parcel sizes of 2 to 20 acres or larger will be permitted depending on the slope criteria in the underlying community plan. No lot proposed by this project will be less than 2 acres. (See below for details on project consistency with the community plan).

(2) Community Plan

The project is subject to the Ramona Community Plan. The Plan set forth specific policies that are intended to guide development within the Montecito Rancho Specific Plan Area. The policies provide for mostly single detached residential uses with some industrial use allowed in the southwesterly area adjacent to the Ramona Airport. Although the 0.5 du./ac. density would allow 417 units, the project proposes only 358 residential units. This project does not propose any industrial development. It is not possible to determine if the project is consistent with the Community Plan without additional information. A Land Use and Community Character technical study will need to be completed and discussed as a part of the EIR. One of the

additional items that will need to be provided is a table indicating the average slope of each parcel to determine if the minimum parcel size needs to be greater than 4 acres.

B. Zoning

(1) Use Regulations

The project site included zones with two different Use Regulations. Most of the site has the Specific Planning Area (S88) Use Regulations. A triangular area in the northwesterly portion of the site has the Limited Agricultural (A70) Use Regulations. The proposed Family Residential Use Type is a permitted use within both these use regulations.

(2) Density

The project site has two zones. One covers most of the site and includes a density of 0.5 dwelling unit per acre. The other is a triangular area in the northwesterly portion of the site that has 0.25 dwelling unit per acre. The overall density of the proposed project is consistent with these designations.

(3) Other Development Regulations

a. Minimum lot area: Most of the project site has a dash (-) instead of a minimum lot area designator. The dash indicates that lot size is not regulated by the zoning. For this project the minimum lot area is regulated by language in the Community Plan that allows 2-acre minimum lot area where a lot has an average slope of less than 25 percent and 4-acre minimum where the average slope is greater than 25 percent. The triangular area in the northwesterly portion of the site has a 4-acre minimum lot area designator. The lots in this area are less than 4 acres. Staff would suggest that the triangular area be rezoned to the same zoning as the rest of the Specific Plan area but there also appear to be slopes greater than 25 percent present and these lots may need to be 4-acre anyway.

b. Building Type: Both zones are subject to the "C" designator that allows the proposed single detached residences.

c. Height: Both zones are subject to the "G" designator that allows two stories with a maximum height of 35 feet. Although no development is proposed at this time this designator is typical for most of the single detached residential zones in the County.

d. Setback: Most of the project site has a "V" Setback Designator. This indicates that setbacks are to be established during a Planned Development, Use Permit or Site Plan review procedure. The application is not complete because no application for such permits has been filed. Options must be discussed in the EIR to address this issue. The triangular area in the northwesterly portion of the site has a "C" Setback Designator that requires: 60-foot front yard, 15-foot interior side yard, 35-foot exterior side yard, and a 25-foot rear yard.

C. Subdivision Ordinance

(1) Design Standards

Section 81.401 of the Subdivision Ordinance sets forth design requirements for all major subdivisions. This project proposed numerous waivers of these requirements particularly the 3:1 depth to width ratio. The EIR and the Land Use and Community Character technical study must address the proposed waivers. A table should indicate which lots require a waiver; which criteria is proposed for waivers; and the reason why the waivers should be granted.

(2) Access

Project access will be from the following public roads:

- Montecito Way
- Ash Street
- Cedar Street
- Montecito Ranch Road (Proposed)

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
There may be potential conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health. The EIR should address all applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project and discuss all potentially significant conflicts.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project may have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community. The Montecito Ranch project proposes a residential community including 358 single-family residential homes sites on lots ranging from a minimum of two acres to more than four acres, concentrated on level and gently sloping portions of the site and covering 260 acres of the 935-acre site. The design of Montecito Ranch will provide open space and recreational opportunities including 561 acres of open space, a 6.8-acre historical park designed around the Montecito Ranch House, a 33-acre passive community park and a 12-acre school site. The Land Use and Community Character technical study and EIR should address whether existing or planned land uses or the character of the community are affected by this project.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project may have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Specifically, the project proposes the development of a large Specific Planning Area with significant roadway improvements and utility extensions. The Land Use and Community Character technical study and EIR should address whether the physical arrangement to existing or planned land uses or the character of the community of Ramona are affected by this project.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The project site is entirely made up of the following designations: Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land and Other Land. Therefore, since the project site does not support any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance the project should not result in a potentially significant impact to above mention Important Farmland categories.

   However, the project does propose to convert lands that have historically been utilized for agriculture to non-agricultural use. Included in the land that would be converted to non-agriculture use is approximately 103 acres of prime agricultural soils. The prime agricultural soils include Visalia sandy loams (VaA and VaB) and Ramona sandy loam (RaB). The prime

agricultural soils predominantly exist in the southwest portion of the project site, with an additional portion that straddles the northeastern project boundary. Conversion of these prime agricultural soils is a potentially significant impact that must be discussed in the context of an Agricultural technical study and the EIR.

Furthermore, as proposed the loss of 103 acres of prime agricultural soils may not be consistent with the Ramona Community Plan, conditions 40, 41, and 42.

> Condition 40 states:
> Future potential agricultural uses located within the property shall be defined by more detailed study to determine not only the precise areas for agricultural production, but also the economic considerations associated with that use.
>
> Condition 41 states:
> The minimum lot size permitted within any future agricultural pursuit area shall also be determined by the above analysis. It is presently intended that a minimum lot size of four acres be allowed within that area, and the above study shall address any modifications to that requirement.
>
> Condition 42 states:
> The approximately 103 acres of prime agricultural soils – Visalia sandy loams (VaA and VaB) and Fallbrook (*sic*) sandy loam (RaB) – in the southwest portion of the Montecito Ranch property shall be preserved for agricultural pursuits. Any lot created on these 103 acres shall be identified as agricultural lots.

Therefore, based on the circumstances of this development the project site may result in a potentially significant impact, because the project proposes to convert lands supporting prime agricultural soils to a non-agricultural use. Also, the project may not be compatible with the Ramona Community Plan Conditions 40, 41, and 42. As a result, these potentially significant impacts must be discussed in the context of an Agricultural Technical Study and the EIR.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
Even though, the project does not directly conflict with zoning for the agricultural use, the project may conflict with the intended agricultural uses in the Ramona Community Plan, specifically, conditions 40, 41, and 42 stated above.

Specifically, the project may conflict with minimum lot size for agricultural pursuits and this must be discussed in the Agricultural technical study and the EIR. Furthermore, as proposed the project does not include any uses for agricultural pursuits and this may be in conflict with the Ramona Community Plan. Therefore, even though the project is not directly in conflict with the Specific Plan Area (S88) zoning, because the project is proposing a Specific Plan, the project may be in conflict with the underlining General Plan requirements for the Specific Plan Area and thus it has been determined the project may result in potentially significant impacts to agriculture.

Finally, the project site is not located in an agricultural preserve and is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will not have any impact on agricultural preserves or a Williamson Act contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project site was previously cultivated and contains 103 acres of prime agricultural soils. Implementation of the proposal will result in converting portions of the Montecito Ranch project that formerly included agricultural pursuits and grazing land to residential use and open space and the proposal may result in a potentially significant impact. As a result, these potentially significant impacts must be discussed in the context of an Agricultural technical study and the EIR.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project involves substantial extension of water and sewer lines to the project site and the project proposes to develop the northern Ramona bypass through the project site.

Sewer service will be provided to the project from the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) utilizing the Santa Maria Water Treatment Plant (WTP) for treatment of wastewater. Montecito Ranch will generate approximately 73,000 gallons of sewage per day at buildout. Capacity is available at the Santa Maria WTP to serve the project, however, the project lies outside the RMWD latent powers boundary. In order to be served by the RMWD and utilize the Santa Maria WTP for treatment of wastewater, an off-site gravity sewer line will need to be constructed from the project boundary to the interceptor line located along Santa Maria Creek. Wastewater will be conveyed by means of a 10-inch gravity sewer line south along Montecito Way, east on Montecito Road, and south on Kalbaugh Street to an existing manhole located near the Santa Maria Creek. This line will connect with the existing Santa Maria Interceptor just above the Santa Maria WTP. All wastewater from Montecito Ranch will be collected at the southwest corner of the project. Two on-site lift stations will be required on the eastern portion of the project site to pump wastewater to the west into the gravity sewer collection system and the western portion of the project drains by gravity to the southwest corner of the site. This would provide increased extensions of sewer facilities beyond existing conditions and may allow for the construction of additional dwelling units above those anticipated by the General Plan and zoning designations due to the extensions.

Water service will be provided by RMWD upon completion of constructional improvements to extend service. The project is currently outside of the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) service boundary. However, facilities are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district. Water service to the project is expected to come from the RMWD Zone 1820. Average day water demand for the project at buildout is expected to be 211,200 gallons per day. The project proposes to construct improvements to the existing RMWD water system including the installation of transmission piping off-site to the existing 1820 Zone. Several lots on the western side of the project are too low to be served directly from the 1820 Zone because static pressures would exceed 150 pounds per square inch (psi). The project proposes to construct a pressure reducing station in line with the 1820 Zone system to provide service to these lots. This would provide increased extensions of water

facilities beyond existing conditions and may allow for the construction of additional dwelling units above those anticipated by the General Plan and zoning designations due to the extensions.

The project proposes to develop a portion of the northern Ramona bypass. The project proposes to implement this through the development of Montecito Ranch Road (Select Arterial SA-603) and Montecito Way (SA-330). Montecito Ranch Road will be a public street that will extend through the project site. It is anticipated that SA-603 will be constructed through the project site. Montecito Way will provide access to the southern portion of the project site. The project proposes Montecito Way on-site as the alignment of (SA-330), a County Circulation Element roadway. Montecito Way will be extended north to serve the property owned by the Lemurian Fellowship. Additionally, the project will make improvements to off-site roadways including Ash Street and Monecito Ranch Road to Rangeland. This would provide increased extensions of roadways beyond existing conditions and may allow for the construction of additional dwelling units above those anticipated by the General Plan and zoning designations due to the extensions.

Therefore, based on the information detailed above the project may potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly, creating a potentially significant impact. As a result, the associated growth inducing impacts from expanded sewer facilities, water facilities and roadways must be evaluated in a Growth Inducement technical study and the EIR.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The addition of 358 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing. The historic Montecito Ranch House is the only structure on the site and it will be retained.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Jason Giffen on May 11, 2001 did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type		**Erosion Index**
BnB	Bonsall-Fallbrook sandy loams 2-5% slopes	Severe 9
CIE2	Cieneba coarse sandy loam 15-30% slopes, eroded	Severe16
CmrG	Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30-75% slopes	Severe 1
CnE2	Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams, 9-30% slopes	Severe 16
CnG2	Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams, 30-65% slopes, eroded	Severe 1
FaC2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 5-9% slopes, eroded	Severe 16
FaD2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded	Severe 16
FaE2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 15-30% slopes, eroded	Severe 16
FeE	Fallbrook rocky sandy loam, 9-30% slopes	Severe 16
PfA	Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 0-2% slopes	Severe 16
PfC	Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9% slopes	Severe 16
RaB	Ramona sandy loam, 2-5% slopes	Severe 16
RaC2	Ramona sandy loam, 5-9% slopes, eroded	Severe 16
VaA	Visalia sandy loam, 0-25 slopes	Severe 16
VaB	Visalia sandy loam, 2-5% slopes	Severe 16
BmC	Bonsall sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9%slopes	Moderate 2
VsD2	Vista coarse sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded	Moderate 2
VvD	Vista rocky coarse sandy loam, 5-15% slopes	Moderate 2
VvE	Vista rocky coarse sandy loam, 15-30% slopes	Moderate 2

Many of these soils have severe erodibility and as proposed the project may result in unprotected erodible soils; may alter existing drainage patterns; may be located a wetland or significant drainage feature; and may develop steep slopes. Even though, the project is required to comply

with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, as proposed the project might result in potentially significant erosion. Due to these factors, erosion potential from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils and each soil's associated shrink-swell behavior.

Soil Type		**Shrink/ Swell**
BmC	Bonsall sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9%slopes	High
BnB	Bonsall-Fallbrook sandy loams 2-5% slopes	High
PfA	Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 0-2% slopes	High
PfC	Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9% slopes	High
FaC2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 5-9% slopes, eroded	Moderate
FaD2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 9-15% slopes, eroded	Moderate
FaE2	Fallbrook sandy loam, 15-30% slopes, eroded	Moderate
FeE	Fallbrook rocky sandy loam, 9-30% slopes	Moderate
RaB	Ramona sandy loam, 2-5% slopes	Moderate
RaC2	Ramona sandy loam, 5-9% slopes, eroded	Moderate
CIE2	Cieneba coarse sandy loam 15-30% slopes, eroded	Low
CmrG	Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30-75% slopes	Low
CnE2	Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams, 9-30% slopes	Low
CnG2	Cieneba-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams, 30-65% slopes, eroded	Low
VaA	Visalia sandy loam, 0-25 slopes	Low
VaB	Visalia sandy loam, 2-5% slopes	Low

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils having a HIGH shrink-swell behavior: Bonsall sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9%slopes; Bonsall-Fallbrook sandy loams 2-5% slopes; Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 0-2% slopes; and Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 2-9% slopes. All other mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior and are identified as stable with no adverse potential for

development activity. Any potential impacts as a result of development in the areas with high shrink-swell must be avoided through compliance with the following measures and/or conditions in the Grading Ordinance Requirements Sections 87.403 and 87.410. Compliance with these requirements cannot be determined at this time and may result in potentially unstable soil conditions. Therefore, discussion of the project's potential to create unstable soil conditions must be discussed in the context of the EIR. Note: A soils report with compaction test is required for all fill that is over 12 inches in depth. DPL Form #73, Certification of Fill Compaction Report, completed by a registered engineer is to be submitted after the grading has been done.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
On a site visit completed by Jason Giffen on May 11, 2001 many rock outcroppings were identified. Although none of these rock outcroppings were identified as unique geological features on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan, some of these outcroppings may be considered either scientifically or visually significant. As a result, the potential impacts to any significant geological resources must be discussed in the context of the EIR and supporting technical studies as appropriate.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project is located in a mineral resource area, known as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). This area contains minerals, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from the data available. Additionally, on a site visit conducted by Jason Giffen on May 11, 2001, no past or present mining activities were identified within the project boundaries that would indicate the presence of significant

mineral resources. Therefore, even though complete build-out of the project will result in a loss of the availability of unknown mineral resources to the region, based on current available information and based on the fact that the project site has no evidence of past or present mining activities, the project will not result in a potentially significant loss of the availability of a mineral resource.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal create a potentially adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate and amount of runoff?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal involves significant amounts of grading and may create a potentially adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate and amount of runoff. Therefore, the potentially adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate and amount of runoff must be discussed in the context of a technical study for drainage and flooding (hydrology and hydraulic study) and the EIR. Specifically, the hydrology and hydraulic study should indicate runoff quantities and conditions before and after development of the project, including analysis of existing and proposed drainage facility capacity and lines of inundation by the 100-year flood. Also, the study must include grading plans showing drainage patterns improvements to storm drain system, inlets, points of entry into natural drainage channels, energy dissipaters, etc.

2. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
A Service Availability Letter from the local water district Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) has been provided indicating that the project is currently outside of the Ramona Municipal Water District service area boundary. However, upon review of the Service Availability Letter and based on consultation with Robert Scholl, RMWD, facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected through the satisfaction of the RMWD conditions and development of facilities proposed by the project. However, at this time the demand on the local imported water system cannot be determined and must be further discussed in the context of the

EIR. The EIR must clearly define whether the RMWD can serve the project and whether the project will significantly increase the demand on the local imported water system.

3. Would the proposal have a potentially significant adverse effect on surface water quality?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project proposes a Specific Plan serving 358 single-family residences over a 935-acre area that will include the construction of 40-foot wide roadways. This development will result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces (roofs, driveways, patios, sidewalks, and roads) that reduces the natural purification process of stormwater, and introduction of potential pollutant sources (auto emissions, leaks, drips and maintenance wastes, pet wastes, household pesticides, fertilizers, and hazardous materials, and litter).

The project must comply with water quality standards as described in existing Local, State and Federally mandated regulations to protect surface water quality from potential impacts due to increased non-point source urban runoff. Specifically, the recently adopted Order No. 2001-01 by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, requires that post-development runoff containing pollutant loads which cause or contribute to an exceedance of receiving water quality objectives, or which have not been reduced to the maximum extent practicable is prohibited. As a Copermittee of the San Diego Municipal Stormwater Permit authorized by this Order, the County is responsible for providing mitigation and conditioning development projects to protect the water quality of County water resources.

The applicant is required to develop a Storm Water Management Plan that addresses post-construction impacts of the project. This Plan will be subject to review and approval by the Director of Public Works. The Plan must include the following:

- Evaluation of urban runoff pollution potential posed by the project;
- Evaluation of receiving waters that will receive urban runoff from the project;

- Identify sources of potentially significant post-construction pollutant loading and types of pollutants expected from those sources;

- Identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented that will prevent or reduce to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants from identified sources to stormwater and non-stormwater discharges.

Examples of BMPs may include structural solutions such as the installation of traps or filtration systems in storm drain inlets to collect pollutants or pervious onsite retention/detention areas, or non-structural solutions such as instituting policies requiring regular street sweeping.

- Identify means that will ensure the long-term functioning, operation and maintenance of proposed structural BMPs.

Post-construction pollutant loads in storm water and non-storm water discharges shall not cause or contribute to the degradation of receiving waters or other environmentally sensitive areas. BMPs that incorporate natural systems or approaches, such as reduction of impermeable areas, retention of existing habitat and/or inclusion of natural buffer zones should be considered and used to the maximum extent practicable.

This project is also required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) mandated Statewide General Permit that applies to construction activities. The applicant will be required to contact the appropriate State representatives at the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board to investigate coverage under these permits as follows: For the General Construction Permit, the contact is Jane Ledford (858) 467-3272.

In addition, a pre-construction Stormwater Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of any grading permit. This Plan must be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works and must describe BMPs that the project will employ to control erosion, sedimentation, offsite sediment tracking, and runoff velocity, and address general site and materials management during the construction phase of the project. The applicant will be required to submit the pre-construction Stormwater Management Plan to the Department of Public Works with the grading permit application.

Therefore, all potentially significant adverse effects on surface water quality, specifically relating to stormwater must be address in the context of the EIR and technical studies stormwater.

4. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
Groundwater is not proposed to be utilized by the project. The project will obtain its water supply from the Ramona Municipal Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply. If it is determined that the groundwater will be utilized the project will be subject to Ordinance No. 7994 from Title 6, Division 7, Chapter 7 of the San Diego County Code.

5. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project will obtain its water supply from the Ramona Municipal Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply. Therefore, the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance is not applicable. If it is determined that the groundwater will be utilized the project will be subject to Ordinance No. 7994 from Title 6, Division 7, Chapter 7 of the San Diego County Code.

6. Would the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quality?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project does not indicate any significant potential sources of chemicals or compounds, which will contaminate groundwater sources and decrease the quality of the groundwater to below the standards as set

by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's (SDRWQCB) Basin Plan, Groundwater Quality Objectives. However, prior to construction/grading of the site, the owner and/or facility operator is required to investigate coverage under the General Dewatering Permit by contacting the SDRWQCB.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Based on 10 trips per day per residence, the project will generate 3,580 ADT; exceeding the above thresholds by 1,600 ADT. Furthermore, the project is expecting to generate additional ADT from the historical park, passive park and school, as well as additional through traffic which may generate at least 4,500 ADT for the entire project. Therefore, vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality impact. As a result, the project's potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation must be discussed in the Air Quality technical study and the EIR.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   Based on consultation with County Air Specialist, Joseph De Stefano the project may expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants and should be discussed must be discussed in the Air Quality technical study and the EIR.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. A focused traffic impact analysis is required to assess all potentially significant impacts related traffic volumes and road capacity. The traffic impact analysis should address average daily trips (ADT) generated by the project, impacts, if any, on the level of service of affected County roads, and proposed mitigation measures. The results of the traffic impact analysis should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way). A sight distance analysis is required to assess all potential impacts to traffic safety. The sight distance analysis can be included, as a part of the traffic impact analysis. The analysis should address sight distance analyses affected intersections and proposed mitigation measures. The results of the sight distance analysis of the traffic impact analysis should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with The Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on any County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. The site supports the following sensitive habitat: Diegan coastal sage scrub; southern mixed chaparral; Engelmann oak woodland; southern coast live oak riparian forest; riparian scrub; wetlands; freshwater seep; vernal pools; and non-native grassland.

Pursuant to the CEQA, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP) Ordinance (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely. In order to evaluate these impacts, focused

surveys must be completed during the appropriate time period for the plant and wildlife species listed below by biologist(s) with demonstrable knowledge in field detection of the subject species (focused surveys for Federally listed species shall be in compliance with USFWS protocol, when such protocol exists, and must be done by a USFWS permitted biologist).

Focused surveys required for the following species:

Arroyo toad	*Bufo microscaphus californicus*
Bell's sage sparrow	*Amphispiza belli belli*
Black-shouldered kite	*Elanus caeruleus*
California gnatcatcher	*Polioptila californica californica*
Campo clarkia	*Clarkia delicata*
Cooper's hawk	*Accipiter cooperi*
Engelmann oak	*Quercus engelmannii*
Felt leaved rock mint	*Monardella hypoleuca lanata*
Ferruginous hawk (Winter)	*Buteo regalis*
Fish's milkwort	*Polygala cornuta fishiae*
Golden eagle	*Aquila chrysaetos*
Graceful tarplant	*Holocarpha virgata elongata*
Grasshopper sparrow	*Ammodramus savannarum*
Hermes copper	*Lycaena hermes*
Least Bell's vireo	*Vireo bellii pusillus*
Loggerhead shrike	*Lanius ludovicianus*
Orange-throated whiptail	*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*
Orcutt's brodiaea	*Brodiaea orcuttii*
Palmer's grappling hook	*Harpagonella palmeri*
Peninsular spine flower	*Chorizanthe leptotheca*
Ramona horkelia	*Horkelia truncata*
Red-shouldered hawk	*Buteo lineatus*
Riverside fairy shrimp	*Streptocephalus woottoni*
Rufous-crowned sparrow	*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*
Rush like bristle bush	*Machaeranthera juncea*
San Diego banded gecko	*Coleonyx variegatus abbottii*
San Diego fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta sandiegoensis*
San Diego Thornmint	*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*
Sharp-shinned hawk	*Accipiter striatus*
Southern skullcap	*Scutellaria bolanderi austromontana*
Southern tarplant	*Hemizonia parryi australis*
Southwestern willow flycatcher	*Empidonax trailii extimus*
Stephen's kangaroo rat	*Dipodomys stephensi*

Tricolored blackbird	*Agelaius tricolor*
Turkey vulture	*Cathartes aura*
Vernal barley	*Hordeum intercedens*
Yellow-breasted chat	*Ictera virens*

To date some of these surveys have been initiated and some have been completed. Recent surveys for the California gnatcatchers revealed that approximately 20 California gnatcatchers reside on the property. The California gnatcatchers were distributed into four family groups and two pair. In addition to supporting California gnatcatchers the site has potential to various sensitive species that are known to occur in the area.

Therefore, based on the fact that the site supports and has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats the project may have a potentially significant impact on biological resources. As such any potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the context of a Biological technical study and an EIR.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands Section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The site supports a number of extremely sensitive habitat lands that warrant special attention pursuant to the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance. Sensitive habitat lands were identified on a site visit conducted by Jason Giffen on May 11, 2001. These sensitive habitats may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, conformance with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a Biological technical study and the EIR.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The site supports a number of wetland habitats and wetland buffers that were identified on a site visit conducted by Jason Giffen May 11, 2001. Therefore, the project must be in conformance with the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. These wetlands and wetland buffers may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform with the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers and conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a Biological technical study and the EIR.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The site contains a number of blue-line streams, significant drainages and wetlands, which if impacted may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. However, impacts to these wetlands or watersheds may not be avoidable and as a result may be a significant and unmitigable impact, unless mitigation alternatives can be proposed. Therefore, all significant streams, drainages and wetland must be defined and addressed in a Biological technical study and in the EIR.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
Potential wildlife corridors exist throughout the project site. Wildlife corridors potentially exist along natural drainages through various

sensitive habitat types on-site, including: Diegan coastal sage scrub; southern mixed chaparral; Engelmann oak woodland; southern coast live oak riparian forest; riparian scrub; wetlands; freshwater seep; vernal pools; and non-native grassland. The current project design may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. Some of the wildlife corridors may be vital in linking offsite open space preserves. Impact to the corridors may be significant with the current project design. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife dispersal corridors must be discussed in the Biological technical study and the EIR.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project site and locations of off-site improvements do contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, the project must conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings or complete an Endangered Species Act - Section 7 or 10a with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). As proposed the project may have significant impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub and currently may not conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings. Therefore, impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub must be discussed in the Biological technical study and the EIR and conformance with the local, State and Federal laws relating to Diegan coastal sage scrub must be demonstrated.

XI. HAZARDS

1. Would the proposal present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances?

   Less Than Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   The proposed project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

   Less Than Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners. Therefore, the proposal does not have the potential to interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

   Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   The project may significantly increase the fire hazard if the project is unable to comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. The project has a number of requirements that must incorporated into the project design to ensure that the project will be in compliance with relevant Fire Codes. As proposed the project plans to include a 150-foot fire buffer surrounding all proposed residences consisting of three Zones. Zone A would be 50-feet wide consisting of irrigated, ornamental, low fuel species. Zone B would be 50-feet wide consisting of native plants and requiring selective thinning and pruning of

native vegetation. Long-term ongoing thinning cost may be reduced by the introduction of low growing fire retardant shrubs and ground cover that are visually and horticulturally competitive with the native species. Zone B is also proposed for planting in disturbed areas by replanting appropriate, native plant material in combination with approved non-native species. Seasonal maintenance would be the responsibility of the homeowner. Zone C would be 50 feet wide consisting of native vegetation to be selectively thinned such that the natural aesthetic appearance of the area is preserved while reducing fuel load. Seasonal maintenance would be the responsibility of the homeowner. Compliance with all the fire requirements and specific details of the fire management and mitigation measures must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal involves significant amounts of grading and may create a potentially expose people or property to flooding. Therefore, the potentially significant exposure of people or property to flooding must be discussed in the context of a technical study for drainage and flooding (hydrology and hydraulic study) and the EIR. Specifically, the hydrology and hydraulic study should indicate runoff quantities and conditions before and after development of the project, including analysis of existing and proposed drainage facility capacity and lines of inundation by the 100-year flood. Also, the study must include grading plans showing drainage patterns improvements to storm drain system, inlets, points of entry into natural drainage channels, energy dissipaters, etc.

b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the Resource Protection Ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

5. Would the proposal expose people to any other demonstrable potentially significant health or safety hazard not listed above?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
No other health or safety hazard has been identified in the review of the proposed project.

X. NOISE

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations). Specifically, potential noise impacts exist for residences located adjacent to the Circulation Element road designated in the Ramona Community Plan as SA-603 (Montecito Ranch Road); the extension of Montecito Way; Cedar Street; the proposed elementary school and other facilities on-site and off-site.

Therefore, preliminary review of the project indicates that there is insufficient information to determine whether equipment and operations on-site will exceed County and State Noise Standards, namely, San Diego County Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) and exposure of people to significant noise levels. The County Noise Ordinance does not permit noise levels that impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards. In order for the Department to make a determination on the project's conformance with County noise standards, the applicant must demonstrate that the hourly average sound levels do not exceed either threshold at the property line, as the most stringent condition for the project. To determine conformance a noise analysis must be completed for the project and discussed in the EIR. Furthermore, according to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Ramona Airport adopted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Montecito Ranch is outside of the mapped noise contours and Airport Influence Area for the

Ramona Airport. However, as a part of the noise analysis impacts from the Ramona Airport should be addressed.

2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations). Specifically, potentially significant adverse noise levels may be generated adjacent to the Circulation Element road designated in the Ramona Community Plan as SA-603 (Montecito Ranch Road); the extension of Montecito Way; Cedar Street; the proposed elementary school and other facilities on-site and off-site.

Therefore, preliminary review of the project indicates that there is insufficient information to determine whether equipment and operations on-site will exceed County and State Noise Standards, namely, San Diego County Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) and generate significant noise levels. The County Noise Ordinance does not permit noise levels that impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards. In order for the Department to make a determination on the project's conformance with County noise standards, the applicant must demonstrate that the hourly average sound levels do not exceed either threshold at the property line, as the most stringent condition for the project. To determine conformance a noise analysis must be completed for the project and discussed in the EIR. Furthermore, according to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Ramona Airport adopted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Montecito Ranch is outside of the mapped noise contours and Airport Influence Area for the Ramona Airport. However, as a part of the noise analysis impacts from the Ramona Airport should be addressed.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The EIR must include a section on Public Services with a technical study, because as proposed the project may have a potentially significant impact on public services. A response to this question must be provided within the context of this EIR discussion. The following information was provided on the Facility Availability Forms submitted with the project.

The project is in the Ramona Fire Protection District and it is eligible for service except for APN 280-010-08. The primary fire station that will serve the project is located 6 miles away at 839 San Vicente Road. The expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is 6 minutes. Within the proposed project 150 feet of clearing will be required around all structures. The proposed project is located in a hazardous wildland fire area, and additional fuelbreak requirements may apply. Environmental mitigation requirement should be coordinated with the fire district to ensure that these requirements will not pose fire hazards.

The project will receive water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. The project is in the district except for APN 280-010-08. Facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district.

The project is not within the Ramona Sewer District and it is not within its Sphere-of-Influence boundary. However, facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district.

The project is located entirely within the Ramona Unified School District and it is eligible for service. The project will result in overcrowding at district facilities. Fees will be levied in accordance with state law prior to the issuance of building permits.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;

Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to utilities. Therefore, the EIR must include a section on Public Services with a technical study. A response to this question must be provided within the context of this EIR discussion. The following section details the water and sewer facilities proposed for the project.

The project is currently outside of the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) service boundary. However, facilities are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district. Water service to the project is expected to come from the RMWD Zone 1820. Average day water demand for the project at buildout is expected to be 211,200 gallons per day. The project proposes to construct improvements to the existing RMWD water system including the installation of transmission piping off-site to the existing 1820 Zone. Several lots on the western side of the project are too low to be served directly from the 1820 Zone because static pressures would exceed 150 pounds per square inch (psi). The project proposes to construct a pressure reducing station in line with the 1820 Zone system to provide service to these lots.

Sewer service will be provided to the project from the Ramona Municipal Water District (RMWD) utilizing the Santa Maria Water Treatment Plant (WTP) for treatment of wastewater. Montecito Ranch will generate approximately 73,000 gallons of sewage per day at buildout. Capacity is available at the Santa Maria WTP to serve the project. In order to be served by the RMWD and utilize the Santa Maria WTP for treatment of wastewater, an off-site gravity sewer line will need to be constructed from the project boundary to the interceptor line located along Santa Maria Creek. Wastewater will be conveyed by means of a 10-inch gravity sewer line south along Montecito Way, east on Montecito Road, and south on Kalbaugh Street to an existing manhole located near the Santa Maria Creek. This line will connect with the existing Santa Maria Interceptor just above the Santa Maria WTP. All wastewater from Montecito Ranch will be collected at the southwest corner of the project. Two on-site lift stations will be required on the eastern portion of the project site to pump wastewater to the west into the gravity sewer collection system and the western portion of the project drains by gravity to the southwest corner of the site.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   The project is located adjacent to Highway 78, which is a Second Priority Scenic Highway. Therefore, the project has the potential to result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. As a result, the EIR and a technical study for aesthetics must address potential impacts from development within the viewshed of this road.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
   This project proposes significant landform modification that may result in significant adverse visual impacts. As a result, the EIR and a technical study for aesthetics must address potential impacts from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect. Potential major issues that need to be discussed in the technical study for aesthetics should include a discussion of the need for grading quantities of 2,500,000 cubic yards of cut and fill, cut slope ratios of 1-1/2:1 and maximum cut and slope heights up to 60 feet. The grading quantities should be closer to 3,000 cubic yards per lot. The cut slope ratios should not exceed 2:1 and the slope heights should not exceed 15 feet. An alternative should be proposed that is consistent with these criteria.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposed project supports many steep slopes throughout the project site and as a result the project may not be in conformance with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, in order to demonstrate conformance a slope encroachment table must be completed as required by the Ordinance. In addition, a table indicating the average slope of each lot must be provided and the conformance with the Ordinance must be discussed in the context in of the EIR.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
Previous archeological reconnaissance and surveys have been completed on the Montecito Ranch site. In January 1992, archaeological reconnaissance of Montecito Ranch was performed Gallegos and Associates with a subsequent reconnaissance completed by Brian F. Mooney Associates in 1995. The reconnaissance(s) included a record search that indicated that 39 cultural sites have been recorded on the project site. Additionally, 15 archaeological sites were determined to be significant. In order to adequately evaluate the archaeological sites the completed archaeological survey(s) must be submitted and their conformance with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance must be addressed in the context of the EIR.

Also, the Montecito Ranch House is designated as a Historic Preservation Area in the Ramona Community Plan and as a Resource Conservation Area (RCA) in the County General Plan. The Ranch House is planned to for on-site preservation. Therefore, the Montecito Ranch House must have a completed Historical Preservation Plan and its conformance with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

In conclusion, all impacts to cultural resources must be discussed in the survey and within the EIR.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:

   a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;

   b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);

   c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;

   d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or

e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The proposal may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Previous archeological reconnaissance and surveys have been completed on the Montecito Ranch site. In January 1992, archaeological reconnaissance of Montecito Ranch was performed Gallegos and Associates with a subsequent reconnaissance completed by Brian F. Mooney Associates in 1995. The reconnaissance(s) included a record search that indicated that 39 cultural sites have been recorded on the project site. Additionally, 15 archaeological sites were determined to be significant. In order to adequately evaluate the archaeological sites the completed archaeological survey(s) must be submitted and addressed in the context of the EIR.

Also, the Montecito Ranch House is designated as a Historic Preservation Area in the Ramona Community Plan and as a Resource Conservation Area (RCA) in the County General Plan. The Ranch House is planned for on-site preservation. Therefore, the Montecito Ranch House must have a completed Historical Preservation Plan and must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

In conclusion, all impacts to cultural resources must be discussed in the survey and within the EIR.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
As discussed in Section VII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., and 4., and Section XIII, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., 2., and 3., the project may degrade the quality of the environment and may substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project may cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and may threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project may reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and may eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, an EIR is required to discuss the potentially significant impacts of the project.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined significant unmitigated environmental impacts may result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals must be addressed in the context of an EIR.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
The incremental impacts of the project may be cumulatively considerable and must be considered for exceeding the threshold of being cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. All cumulatively considerable impacts must be discussed in the EIR.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:
In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/ Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings and these potentially significant impacts must be considered in the EIR.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.

2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: None.

3. Mitigation measures: None.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7, Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701 through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b, Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology

ND0202\0109013-ISF;tf

US Fish and Wildlife Service
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2730 Loker Avenue, West San
Carlsbad, California 92008
(760) 431-9440

CA Dept. of Fish & Game
4949 Viewridge Avenue
Diego, California 92123-1662
(858) 467-4201
FAX (858) 467-4235

BS | 56

In Reply Refer to FWS-SDG-2787.1

RECEIVED
APR 05 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE
MAR 29 2002

Gary L. Pryor, Director
County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, California 92123-1666

Attn: Mr. Jason Giffen

Re: Notice of Preparation for the Montecito Ranch Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, San Diego County, California (SCH# 2002021132)

Dear Mr. Pryor:

The California Department of Fish and Game (Department) and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) (collectively, "Wildlife Agencies") have reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) and associated Initial Study, Environmental Analysis Form, and Figures for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Montecito Ranch Specific Plan, received on February 28, 2002. The proposed project is a 935-acre residential community that will include 358 single family residences on lots ranging from two to approximately four acres, a community park, and a 12-acre school site within the Ramona Community Planning Area in an unincorporated portion of San Diego County (County). The Wildlife Agencies have several concerns regarding the potential effects of this project on sensitive biological resources and the following recommendations will assist the County in your analysis of direct and indirect project impacts for the Environmental Impact Report.

The primary concern and mandate of the Service is the protection of fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats. The Service comments on any public notices for Federal permits or licenses affecting the Nation's waters (e.g., Clean Water Act, Section 404 and Rivers and Harbor Act of 1899, Section 10) pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. The Service is also responsible for administering the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*); Act). The Department is a Trustee Agency and a Responsible Agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Sections 15386 and 15381 respectively. Pursuant to Section 1802 of the Fish and Game Code, the Department has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. As a Trustee Agency, the Department must be consulted by the Lead Agency during the preparation and public review for project-specific CEQA documents if there are potential impacts to biological resources. The Department reviews proposed projects, comments on their impacts, and determines whether the mitigation measures or alternatives proposed are feasible

and appropriate. Under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), it is the Department's charge to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance any endangered species or any threatened species and its habitat (Section 2052 of the Fish and Game Code). The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program.

The proposed project is a residential community with 358 single-family home sites on 2- to 4-acre lots. The project will directly impact 260 acres of the 935-acre site. The remainder of the property will consist of 561 acres of open space, a 6.8-acre historical park designed around the Montecito Ranch House, a 33-acre community park, and a 12-acre school site. The project is located north of the Montecito Way/El Paso Street intersection and south of State Route 78, between Weekend Villa Road and Indian Hills Road, within the community of Ramona. The vegetation communities on-site include Diegan coastal sage scrub, southern mixed chaparral, Engelmann oak woodland, southern coast live oak riparian forest, riparian scrub, wetlands, freshwater seep, vernal pools, annual grassland, eucalyptus woodland, agriculture, and disturbed habitat.

Specific Comments

1. The project site supports the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*; gnatcatcher) and may support other listed species as well, including the federally endangered San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*; fairy shrimp), arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*; toad), and Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*; SKR) which is known to have occupied this property as recently as 1998. The property contains designated critical habitat for the gnatcatcher and fairy shrimp. The proposed Montecito Ranch Road may also impact designated critical habitat for the toad. One of the basic purposes of CEQA is to "prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible" (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15002 (a)(3)). Because of the magnitude of the acreage involved and the many sensitive species and habitats that would be negatively affected or lost by the proposed project, the CEQA alternatives analysis for this project is extremely important.

   The Wildlife Agencies are particularly interested in the EIR describing "a <u>range</u> of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or <u>substantially lessen</u> any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives," as required by Section 15126.6 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines (emphases added). The alternatives are to include "alternatives [that] would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly" (Section 15126.6 [b] of the CEQA Guidelines). "The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making" (Section 15126.6 [f] of the CEQA Guidelines). The Wildlife Agencies will consider the alternatives analyzed in the context of their relative impacts on biological resources on both a local and regional level. We strongly recommend that the EIR's discussion of the no action alternative (i.e., no construction) explore the potential for acquisition of the property for conservation in perpetuity.

2. We recommend that the project design maximize the contiguity of the biological open space both to the undeveloped land beyond the project footprint and between adjacent parcels. Without contiguity (i.e., with habitat fragmentation), there would be substantial loss of the land's long-term conservation value, as well as value to these areas as on-site mitigation that the EIR may propose.

3. The EIR should discuss the intended purpose of the open space and provide a detailed discussion of any uses to be permitted, including the placement of trails or other uses. Impacts to biological resources due to these uses should be fully disclosed. Please include a discussion on the need for the proposed trails. Any lands proposed for the conservation of biological resources either on- or off-site, should discuss management and monitoring in perpetuity to preserve their biological value, including a suitable funding mechanism and management entity.

4. We are concerned about the potential project-related direct and indirect impacts to on-site vernal pools, drainages, and the biological resources and the species that they support. We recommend avoidance of any development which would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values. Unavoidable impacts should be offset with mitigation measures that assures there will be "no net loss" of either wetland habitat values or acreage. Development includes, but is not limited to, conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands, vernal pools, and watercourses, whether intermittent or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. The reinforced concrete boxes with wing walls and/or reinforced concrete pipe culverts that are proposed for use where the on-site creek bed intersects with development, should be large enough to facilitate movement of large mammals, including mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), and bobcat (*Felis rufus*) or other species, as appropriate. The EIR should also include project alternatives that avoid all impacts to the creekbed.

   Arroyo toads are known to breed in the nearby Santa Maria Creek. It is possible that the toad may also be found on this property, either in onsite drainages or uplands. Upland habitats used by the arroyo toad during the non-breeding season include alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grassland, and oak woodland. Degradation or loss of riparian and upland habitats surrounding streams used by the toad reduces or eliminates their foraging and overwintering habitat (Service 2001). Additionally, the proposed Montecito Ranch Road will be partially located within designated critical habitat for the arroyo toad; therefore, if there is a Federal action associated with this project, formal consultation may be required.

   Vernal pools are an extremely sensitive and declining habitat type in the County of San Diego; therefore, avoidance and minimization of impacts are recommended. In addition, a portion of this property is within designated critical habitat for the San Diego fairy shrimp;

therefore, if there is a proposed Federal action associated with this project, formal consultation will be required.

5. The Environmental Analysis Form states, "the proposed project could significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff [and] could have adverse effect[s] on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could propose to change or accelerate flow in the watercourse." The Wildlife Agencies are concerned about the effects the project-related changes in the surface flows may have on habitats and biological resources supported by the onsite drainages. In addition to modifications in peak flows, we are concerned about changes in the velocity, volume, duration, and frequency of wet- and dry-weather flows and flows from less than the100-year events upon which the hydrological and flooding analyses are usually based. Over time, these changes can seriously damage the morphology and other physical parameters (e.g., shading, temperature) of stream habitats. Increases in flows from impervious surfaces associated with urbanization can result in: 1) stream bed scouring and habitat degradation; 2) shoreline erosion and stream bank widening; 3) loss of aquatic species; and 4) decreased baseflow (USEPA 1999). As we oppose any development which would result in a reduction of wetland habitat values or area, we recommend that the project design and operation avoid or minimize the increase in dry- and wet-weather flows by the integration of best management practices (BMPs) on site (i.e., upstream from the ultimate point of discharge to a natural waterbody) to attenuate the flows and reduce impacts on the stream habitats and resources. Examples of BMPs to consider include appropriately sized grassy swales and vegetated detention basins. The proposed site plans should clearly identify the BMPs, or areas reserved for them, that would allow for infiltration and retention, providing attenuation of the surface flows.

   Changes in hydrology can destroy or severely modify the dynamic nature of the vernal pool basins, and riparian systems upon which sensitive and endangered species depend for reproduction, development, and survival. Human activities that affect water quality, influence the amount and timing of non-flood flows or frequency and intensity of floods, affect wetland communities, or alter sedimentation dynamics, can reduce or eliminate the suitability of streams and vernal pools for arroyo toad and fairy shrimp breeding, respectively.

6. Landscape connectivity enhances population viability for many species, and until recently, most species lived in well-connected landscapes (Beier and Noss 1998). Recent studies offer strong evidence that corridors provide sufficient connectivity to improve the viability of populations in habitats connected by wildlife movement corridors or habitat linkages (Beier and Noss 1998). For relatively sedentary bird species such as coastal California gnatcatchers, connectivity of habitat patches may be the most important landscape feature for maintaining species diversity of native biota (Soule et al. 1988). Movement corridors and habitat linkages may counteract the effects of fragmentation, and may eliminate or minimize the attrition of species over time by facilitating dispersal and recolonization (Willis 1974, Diamond 1975, Brown and Kodric-Brown 1977, Frankel and Soule 1981, Soule and Simberloff 1985, Noss and Harris 1986, Forman and Godron 1986, Diamond et al. 1987, Noss 1987). Linkages that support resident populations of animals are more likely

to function effectively as long-distance dispersal conduits for those species (Bennett 1990). The EIR should include an assessment of impacts to onsite corridors and linkages, and provide a discussion of all feasible alternatives in order to avoid any loss of this important ecological function.

7. The introduction of nonnative plant and animal species can reduce the quality of native habitats onsite. Accordingly, we request that no invasive exotic plant species be used in the landscaping for the proposed project. We recommend the use of native plants to the greatest extent feasible in the landscape areas for the project. Exotic plant species not to be used include those species listed on Lists A & B of the California Exotic Pest Plant Council's list of "Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California as of October 1999." This list includes such species as: pepper trees, pampas grass, fountain grass, ice plant, myoporum, black locust, capeweed, tree of heaven, periwinkle, sweet alyssum, English ivy, French broom, Scotch broom, and Spanish broom. A copy of the complete list can be obtained by contacting the California Exotic Pest Plant Council at 32912 Calle del Tesoro, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675-4427, or by accessing their web site at http://www.caleppc.org.

8. The Wildlife Agencies and the County are currently preparing a habitat conservation plan for the North County Segment of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) which includes the community of Ramona. The EIR must address the context of Montecito Ranch in relation to this regional planning effort. The development footprint for Montecito Ranch should not preclude future preserve design for the North County Segment. Analysis of this regional planning effort should include a review of all potential development projects adjacent to Montecito Ranch. This should include a written analysis and mapping of the project's proposed open space areas, linkage/corridors and development footprint in relation to future projects that may development in the vicinity. This analysis must assess how the proposed open space for Montecito Ranch will contribute to regional conservation planning efforts for the Santa Maria Valley in the North County Segment of the MSCP.

9. The non-native grassland (NNG) on site is particularly important as foraging habitat for raptors including burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia hypugea*, a State Species of Special Concern [CSC]), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*, a Fully Protected Species[1] [FPS] and a CSC), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*, a CSC), prairie falcon (*Falco mexicanus*, a CSC), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*, a FPS). Primarily due to development, raptor foraging areas are rapidly disappearing in coastal San Diego County. It is likely that the loss of raptor foraging habitat is significant, and impacts on this resource warrant mitigation. The oak woodlands on site likely support nesting raptors. Construction (including clearing and grading) should avoid raptor breeding season (February 1 - August 30, or July 31 for *Buteo* spp.).

General Comments

---

1 Pursuant to Section 3511 of the California Fish and Game Code this designation prohibits take or possession of the designated bird species at any time (i.e., no take authorizations from the State are available). This also applies to any parts of the animal (e.g., in the case of birds, their eggs).

To enable the Wildlife Agencies to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the DEIR:

1. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.

2. A complete list and assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying State or federally listed rare, threatened, endangered, or proposed candidate species, California Species-of-Special Concern and/or State Protected or Fully Protected species, and any locally unique species and sensitive habitats. Specifically, the DEIR should include:

   a. A thorough assessment of Rare Natural Communities on site and within the area of impact, following the Department's Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities.

   b. A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of impact. The Department's California Natural Diversity Data Base in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 327-5960 to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code.

   c. An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered species on site and within the area of impact. Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (see CEQA Guidelines, § 15380).

   d. Discussions regarding seasonal variations in use by sensitive species of the project site as well as the area of impact on those species, using acceptable species-specific survey procedures as determined through consultation with the Wildlife Agencies. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted in conformance with established protocols at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required.

3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect all biological resources. All facets of the project should be included in this assessment. Specifically, the DEIR should provide:

   a. Specific acreage and descriptions of the types of wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and other sensitive habitats that will or may be affected by the proposed project or project alternatives. Maps and tables should be used to summarize such information.

   b. Discussions regarding the regional setting, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(a), with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region that would be affected by the project. This discussion is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts.

c. Detailed discussions, including both qualitative and quantitative analyses, of the potentially affected listed and sensitive species (fish, wildlife, plants), and their habitats on the proposed project site, area of impact, and alternative sites, including information pertaining to their local status and distribution. The anticipated or real impacts of the project on these species and habitats should be fully addressed.

d. Discussions regarding indirect project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed NCCP reserve lands. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address: project-related changes on drainage patterns on and downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-project fate of runoff from the project site.

e. Discussions regarding possible conflicts resulting from wildlife-human interactions at the interface between the development project and natural habitats. The zoning of areas for development projects or other uses that are nearby or adjacent to natural areas may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions.

f. An analysis of cumulative effects, as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, and past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed concerning their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

g. If applicable, an analysis of the effect that the project may have on completion and implementation of regional and/or subregional conservation programs. Under Section 2800 through Section 2840 of the Fish and Game Code, the Department, through the NCCP program, is coordinating with local jurisdictions, landowners, and the Federal Government to preserve local and regional biological diversity. Coastal sage scrub is the first natural community to be planned for under the NCCP program. The Department recommends that the Lead Agency ensure that the development of this and other proposed projects do not preclude long-term preserve planning options and that projects conform with other requirements of the NCCP program. Jurisdictions participating in the NCCP program should assess specific projects for consistency with the NCCP Conservation Guidelines. Additionally, the jurisdictions should quantify and qualify: 1) the amount of coastal sage scrub within their boundaries; 2) the acreage of coastal sage scrub habitat removed by individual projects; and 3) any acreage set aside for mitigation. This information should be kept in an updated ledger system.

4. The EIR should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats, as well as measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Rare Natural Communities from project-related impacts. The Department considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance.

Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance, and where avoidance is infeasible, a reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, off-site mitigation through acquisition and preservation in perpetuity of the affected habitats should be addressed. The Wildlife Agencies generally do not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts on rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

This discussion should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values where preservation and/or restoration is proposed. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc. Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of the mitigation site; (b) the plant species to be used; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) time of year that planting will occur; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the entity(ies) that will guarantee achieving the success criteria and provide for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.

Mitigation measures to alleviate indirect project impacts on biological resources must be included, including measures to minimize changes in the hydrologic regimes on site, and means to convey runoff without damaging biological resources, including the morphology of on-site and downstream habitats.

5. As discussed previously, descriptions and analyses of a range of alternatives to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. The analyses must include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas of lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

If appropriate, a jurisdictional delineation of lakes, streams, and associated riparian habitats should be included in the EIR, including a wetland delineation pursuant to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service definition (Cowardin 1979) adopted by the Department. Please note that wetland and riparian habitats subject to the Department's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The proposed project may require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA). The Department has direct authority under Fish and Game Code Section 1600 *et. seq.* regarding any proposed activity that would divert, obstruct, or affect the natural flow or change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake. The Department's issuance of a SAA for a project that is subject to CEQA requires CEQA compliance actions by the Department as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Department may consider the City's (Lead Agency's) CEQA documentation. To minimize additional requirements by the Department pursuant to Section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the documentation should fully identify the potential

impacts to the lake, stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the agreement. A SAA notification form may be obtained by writing to the Department of Fish and Game, 4949 Viewridge Avenue, San Diego, California 92123-1662, or by calling (858) 636-3160, or by accessing the Department's web site at www.dfg.ca.gov/1600. The Department's SAA Program holds regularly scheduled pre-project planning/early consultation meetings. To make an appointment, please call our office at (858) 636-3160.

The Wildlife Agencies appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NOP. We are available to work with the City and their consultants to obtain any necessary permits for the proposed project. Please contact Patricia Cole of the Service at (760) 431-9440, or Nancy Frost of the Department at (858) 637-5511 if you have any questions or comments concerning this letter.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gilbert
Assistant Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Theresa A. Stewart
William E. Tippets
Environmental Program Manager
California Department of Fish and Game

cc: State Clearinghouse

Literature Cited

Beier, Paul A., and Reed F. Noss. 1998. Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? Conservation Biology 12(6):1241-1252

Bennett, A. F. 1990. Habitat Corridors: Their role in Wildlife Management and Conservation. Arthur Rylah Institute for Environmental Research, Department of Conservation and Environment, Melbourne, Australia.

Brown, J. H., and A. Kodric-Brown. 1977. Turnover rates in insular biogeography: Effect immigration on extinction. Ecology 58:445-449.

Cowardin, Lewis M., V. Carter, G. C. Golet, and E. T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Diamond, J. M. 1975. The island dilemma: lessons of modern biogeographic studies for the design of natural reserves. Biological Conservation 7:129-146

Diamond, J. M., K. D. Bishop, and S. Van Balen. 1987. Bird survival in an isolated Javan woodland: island or mirror? Conservation Biology 1:132-142

Forman, R. T. T., and M. Godron. 1986. Landscape ecology. John Wiley and sons, New York, New York, USA

Frankel, O H., and M.E. Soule. 1981. Conservation and evolution. Cambridge University Press, New York, New York, USA, and Cambridge, England

Noss, R. F., and L. D. Harris. 1986. Nodes, networks and MUMS: preserving diversity at all scales. Environmental Management 10:299-309

Noss, R. F. 1987. Corridors in real landscapes: a reply to Simberloff and Cox. Conservation Biology1:159-164

Schueler, T. 1994. The Importance of Imperviousness. In: Watershed Protection Techniques 1(3): 100-111.

Service. 2001. Final Designation of the Critical Habitat for the Arroyo Toad; Final Rule. Federal Register. Vol. 66, No. 26, Wednesday, February 7, 2001. Pp. 9414-9450.

Soule, M. E., and D. Simberloff. 1985. What do genetics and ecology tell us about the design of nature reserves. Biological Conservation 35:19-40

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Storm Water Best Management Practices. EPA-821-R-99-012. Pp. 4-24

Wilson, E. O. 1974. Populations and local extinctions of birds on Barro Colorado Island, Panama. Ecological Monographs 44:153-169

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY GRAY DAVIS, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 11
P.O. BOX 85406
SAN DIEGO, CA 92186-5406
PHONE: (619) 688-6954
FAX: (619) 688-4299

March 29, 2002

11-SD-078
PM 33.1
(K.P. 53.3)

Mr. Jason Giffen
County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, Mail Station 0650
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

Dear Mr. Giffen:

NOP for Montecito Ranch – SP 01-001; TM 5250; Log No. 01-09-013; SCH 2002021132

- No vehicle or pedestrian access will be allowed directly from State Route 78 (SR-78) to the planned Passive Park, which is adjacent to SR-78.

- A focussed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is needed to analyze and propose appropriate mitigation for the impacts to SR-78 and State Route 67. It appears that there will be no direct access from the project to SR-78, however, indirect access will affect the SR-78 intersections in the area, particularly Ash Street, Montecito Road and Olive Street. The traffic analysis should be based on the year 2020 traffic forecast for the region.

- The Department requires Level of Service (LOS) C or better at State owned facilities, including intersections. If an intersection is currently below LOS C, any increase in delay from project generated traffic must be analyzed and mitigated. Please refer to the Department's January 2001 Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies for additional TIS information.

- The offsite water exhibit shows a 12" PVC water line connecting to an existing 14" water line within the SR-78 right of way. As improvements are needed within the Department's right of way, the County would be responsible for assessing and mitigating the environmental impacts of those improvements and for obtaining an encroachment permit from the Department for that work. As the NOP acknowledges, there is the potential for a number of environmental issues in the area including sensitive biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources (SR-78 is an eligible scenic highway), and air quality issues (if additional traffic signals are proposed or queing is increased). The County would also be responsible for obtaining any necessary permits and approval for any proposed work within the SR-78 right of way from the relevant resource agencies.

- The encroachment permit process will proceed more smoothly and expeditiously if these issues are clearly addressed in the relevant sections of the County's EIR.

Our contact person for SR-78 is Henry Morris, Route Manager, at (619) 688-6881.

Sincerely,

L. Salazar

for BILL FIGGE, Chief
Development Review and Public Transportation Branch

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS – M.S.#40
1120 N STREET
P. O. BOX 942873
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001
PHONE (916) 654-4959
FAX (916) 653-9531

BS/JG

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

RECEIVED
APR 03 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

March 28, 2002

Mr. Jason Giffen
San Diego County
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

Dear Mr. Giffen:

Re: *San Diego County's Notice of Preparation (NOP) for Montecito Ranch Specific Plan; SCH# 2002021132*

The California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, reviewed the above-referenced document with respect to airport-related noise and safety impacts and regional aviation land use planning issues pursuant to CEQA. The following comments are offered for your consideration.

The proposal is for a residential community including 358 single-family homes on lots ranging from two acres to more than four acres. The NOP also states that the 358 homes will be on approximately 260 acres. 358 homes on 260 acres would average out to approximately 1.38 dwelling units per acre, not one dwelling unit per two-four acres. The proposal also includes a school site.

The project site is located approximately one-third of a mile, at its closest point, to the Ramona Airport and will be subject to aircraft overflights. The draft EIR should, therefore, address potential airport-related noise and safety impacts. The proposal should also be coordinated with the Ramona Airport Manager, Richard Selinger, to ensure that the proposal will be compatible with future as well as existing airport operations.

In addition, since the school site appears to be within two miles of the airport runway, in accordance with Education Code Section 17215, a school site evaluation by the Division of Aeronautics will be required prior to acquisition of the land by the school district. The school district should be advised to submit written notification to the State Department of Education requesting an evaluation.

The need for compatible and safe land uses near airports in California is both a local and a state issue. Along with protecting individuals who reside or work near an airport, the Division of Aeronautics views each of the 250 public

use airports in California as part of the statewide transportation system, which is vital to the state's continued prosperity. This role will no doubt increase as California's population continues to grow and the need for efficient mobility becomes more crucial. We strongly feel that the protection of airports from incompatible land use encroachment is vital to California's economic future.

These comments reflect the areas of concern to the Department's Division of Aeronautics with respect to airport-related noise and safety impacts and regional airport land use planning issues. We advise you to contact our district office concerning surface transportation issues.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal. We look forward to reviewing the draft EIR If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 654-5314.

Sincerely,

Sandy Hesnard

SANDY HESNARD
Aviation Environmental Planner

c: State Clearinghouse, Ramona Airport

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Edwin F. Lowry, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Vinston H. Hickox
Agency Secretary
California Environmental
Protection Agency

Gray Davis
Governor

RECEIVED
MAR 25 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

March 15, 2002

Mr. Jason Giffen
Project Environmental Analyst
Department of Planning and Land Use
County of San Diego
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, MS 0650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE MONTECITO RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN (SCH #2002021132)

Dear Mr. Giffen:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-mentioned project.

Based on the review of the document, DTSC's comments are as follows:

1) The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the Project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances at the Project area.

2) The draft EIR needs to identify any known or potentially contaminated site within the proposed Project area. For all identified sites, the ND needs to evaluate whether conditions at the site pose a threat to human health or the environment.

3) The draft EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may require remediation, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

4) The NOP fails to address the rest of the Hazards' section checklist of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) which includes the following questions:

The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our Web-site at www.dtsc.ca.gov.

Printed on Recycled Paper

- Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

- Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

5) The draft EIR should elaborate the past and current activities that conducted at the site.

6) If any vacant buildings are currently located on the project site, investigate the presence of lead paints and asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in the currently existing building structures. If the presence of lead or ACMs is suspected, proper precautions should be taken during any future demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with the California environmental regulations.

7) If the project site is currently or previously used for agricultural purposes, onsite soils may contain pesticide residues. The site may have contributed to soil and/or groundwater contamination. Proper investigation and remedial actions should be conducted at the site prior to the new development. As long as the project is proposed for residential development, proper environmental studies should be conducted at the site to evaluate the health risks associated with the presence of these chemicals.

8) The project construction may require soil excavation and/or soil filling in certain areas. Appropriate sampling is required prior to disposal of the excavated soil. If the soil is contaminated, properly dispose it rather than placing it in another location. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to these soils. Also, if the project is planning to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, proper sampling should be conducted to make sure that the imported soil is free of contamination.

9) If the proposed project is within 2,000 feet from a contaminated site, then the proposed development may fall under the "Border Zone of a Contaminated

Property." Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is on a "Border Zone Property." A Phase I Environmental Investigation is necessary to locate the contaminated sites on the proposed project area or on the adjacent properties.

10) The Project Summary of the NOP indicates that the 12-acre school site will support an elementary school to be dedicated to the Ramona Unified School District. During the proposed school property acquisition and/or construction utilizing state funding, it should be in compliance with the Assembly Bill 387 (Wildman) and Senate Bill 162 (Escutia) which requires a comprehensive environmental review process and that DTSC's approval is required. DTSC's role in the assessment, investigation, and cleanup of proposed school sites is to ensure that the selected properties are free of contamination, and if the property is contaminated, that it is cleaned up to a level that is protective of the students and faculty who will occupy the new school. A study of the site is to be conducted to provide basic information for determining if there has been a release, or if there is a threatened release of a hazardous material including agricultural chemicals or if there maybe a naturally occurring hazardous material present at the site, that may pose a risk to human health or the environment. Though the proposed daycare and preschool construction may not be using state funds, the purpose of the bill is to protect the children who will be attending this school. Therefore, proper environmental studies should be conducted to ensure that a threat to the school/day care children's health and the environment does not exist at the site.

11) Household hazardous waste management should be addressed in the draft EIR. It is evident that the proposed project will increase household hazardous wastes.

12) A groundwater investigation may also be necessary based on the nature of on-site contaminants and the depth to the groundwater.

13) If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate Health and Safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the draft EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

DTSC provides guidance for the Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) preparation and cleanup oversight through the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP). Also, DTSC is administering the $85 million Cleanup Loans and Environmental

Assistance to Neighborhoods (CLEAN) program, which provides low-interest loans to investigate and cleanup hazardous materials at properties where redevelopment is likely to have a beneficial impact to a community. The CLEAN program consists of two main components: low interest loans of up to $100,000 to conduct PEAs of underutilized properties; and loans of up to 2.5 million for the cleanup or removal of hazardous materials also at underutilized urban properties. These loans are available to developers, businesses, schools, and local governments.

For additional information on the VCP of CLEAN program, please visit DTSC's web site at www.dtsc.ca.gov. If you would like to meet/discuss this matter further, please contact Mr. Johnson P. Abraham, Project Manager at (714) 484-5476.

Sincerely,

Haissam Y. Salloum, P.E.
Unit Chief
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch
Cypress Office

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief
Planning and Environmental Analysis Section
CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
P.O. Box 806
Sacramento, California 95812-0806

(2)

Bill Stocks

RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Date: 3-22-02 Item Number: 5

Description: TM 5250, Montecito Ranch, NOI for EIR
SP01-001

MOTION:

TO INCLUDE UNDER TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION, THE EIR SHOULD INCLUDE A STUDY WITHOUT INCLUDING SA 603 DUE TO ELIMINATION OF THE SA 603 AS WAS APPROVED BY THE RCPG AND INCLUDED IN THE RAMONA MASTER ROAD PLAN.

STUDY ALL OF THE HISTORIC AREA FINDINGS, LOOK AT ALL ENDANGERED SPECIES OUT THERE, TAKE A LOOK AT THE LOCAL GOLDEN EAGLE POPULATION THAT OCCUPIES THE GRASSLAND AND IDENTIFY IMPACTS TO THE EAGLES DUE TO LOSS OF HABITAT.

RECEIVED
MAR 2 8 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

Circle M/S Below	NAME	Yes	No	Check below Abstain	Stand Down	Absent
M / S	Chris Anderson					✓
(M) / S	Carol Angus	✓				
M / S	Keith Bowen					✓
M / S	Steve Butler					✓
M / S	Dale Eiler	✓				
M / S	Janet Gilbert	✓				
M / S	Jeff Hedgecock	✓				
M / S	Debi Jennings					✓
M / S	Kristi Mansolf	✓				
M / (S)	Sam Mitchell	✓				
M / S	Fred Sproul	✓				
M / S	Angus Tobiason		✓			
M / S	Kathy Finley		✓			
M / S	Patrick Uriell					✓
M / S	Dutch van Dierendonck	✓				
	TOTAL	8	2			5
	FINAL		(PASSED)		FAILED	

SIGNATURE: K. Mansolf

(2

RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Date: 3-22-02 Item Number: 5

Description: TM 5250, Montecito Ranch, NOI for EIR

MOTION:

TO SEND TO DPLU ALL COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE AND THE RCPG.

RECEIVED
MAR 28 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

Circle M/S Below	NAME	Yes	No	Check below Abstain	Stand Down	Absent
M / S	Chris Anderson					✓
M / S	Carol Angus	✓				
M / S	Keith Bowen					✓
M / S	Steve Butler					✓
M / S	Dale Eiler	✓				
M / S	Janet Gilbert	✓				
M / S	Jeff Hedgecock	✓				
M / S	Debi Jennings					✓
M / S	Kristi Mansolf	✓				
M / S	Sam Mitchell	✓				
M / S	Fred Sproul	✓				
M / S	Angus Tobiason			✓		
M / S	Kathy Finley	✓				
M / S	Patrick Uriell					✓
M / S	Dutch van Dierendonck	✓				
	TOTAL	9		1		5

FINAL PASSED FAILED

SIGNATURE: K. Mansolf

RECEIVED
MAR 2 8 2002
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND US

COMMENTS ON MONTECITO RANCH BY RCPG 3-22-02, NOI FOR EIR:

- AN AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL STUDY MUST BE DONE TO ADDRESS AIR QUALITY IMPACTS.
- IMPACTS TO THE BURROWING OWL POPULATION IN THE GRASSLANDS MUST BE IDENTIFIED AND ADDRESSED.
- VERNAL POOL INFORMATION MUST BE UPDATED. SOME OF THE POOLS ON SITE CONTAIN ALKALINE PLANTS THAT HAVE NOT YET BEEN NAMED. THIS MUST ALL BE INCLUDE IN THE EIR.
- ROAD RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS TO EXISTING AREAS MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- THE NEED FOR OPEN SPACE FORAGING FOR THE GOLDEN EAGLES MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS.
- FOR BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, APPLICATIONS WHICH WILL HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT TO EXISTING USES IN THE SURROUNDING AREA OR ON THE COMMUNITY CHARACTER.
- APPLICATIONS WHICH WILL NOT RESULT IN PREMATURE DEVELOPMENT OR INDUCE GROWTH THAT FOLLOWS SPAWL TYPE DEVELOPMENT.
- GROWTH INDUCEMENT CONCERNS AS A RESULT OF EXPANSION OF SEWER AND ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ROADS.
- STORM WATER RUNOFF AND WATER QUALITY EFFECTS.
- IMPACTS OF 4500 ADT'S DUE TO THE NUMBER OF PROPOSED DWELLINGS.
- PROPOSAL WITH REFERENCE TO USAGE OR DEVELOPMENT BOTH WITH AND WITHOUT SA 603 AND SA 330 SINCE THE RCPG HAS REMOVED BOTH FROM THE CIRCULATION ELEMENT.
- VERNAL POOL STUDIES AND GEOLOGIC AND DRAINAGE STUDIES SHOULD BE DONE ON A YEAR WITH NORMAL RAINFALL.
- THE USE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF GROUNDWATER AND THE IMPACTS ON THE COMMUNITY OF RAMONA AS A WHOLE MUST BE IDENTIFIED.
- PARKING FOR THE SCHOOL SITE AND PARKS MUST BE CONSIDERED.
- IMPACTS ON OPEN SPACE IN PEOPLE'S BACK YARDS MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- IMPACTS TO GNATCATCHERS AND COASTAL SAGE SCRUB MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- MITIGATION FOR GNATCATCHERS AND COASTAL SAGE SCRUB SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ON SITE.
- OFF SITE PARKING SHOULD BE ADDRESSED. PEOPLE LIVING IN THE PROJECT WILL SHOP, ETC., IN RAMONA. THERE IS INSUFFICIENT PARKING NOW.
- IMPACTS TO COMMUNITY CHARACTER MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- NOISE IMPACTS TO THE SURROUNDING AREA, BOTH DURING CONSTRUCTION AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- IMPACTS OF 20 FOOT SIDEYARDS TO A RURAL ATMOSPHERE MUST BE CONSIDERED.

RCPG COMMENTS ON MONTECITO RANCH NOI FOR EIR, CONT'D, 3-22-02

- POTENTIAL OF DEGRADATION OF LEVEL OF SERVICE OF AFFECTED ROADWAYS SHOULD INCLUDE STATE HIGHWAYS AND COUNTY ROADS.
- IMPACTS TO AGRICULTURE AND PRIME SOILS MUST BE CONSIDERED.

Against Montecito

TO the RCPG
RE: Montecito Ranch

3/22/02

I think we all agree that Ramona is unique in the county. At first it was more accidental due to our location, but for some time now more and more of us have woken up to what we have here. We have stated the county and we have consciously focused on protecting our way of life, our rural atmosphere.

What do you think, could do the most damage to our vision of Ramona?

Well, it's before you right now and it contains all the necessary components:

A project that doesn't comply in any way, shape or form with our standards for trails and pathways No T & T input

A project which will NOT attract the kind of people we need to appreciate and carry on our vision for Ramona's future

A project that will leave us grid locked on our roads no traffic study

A developer who has absolutely no intention of making a contribution to the children of Ramona, not spending a penny on schools, new or existing

A project that will destroy an entire neighborhood.

I live in that neighborhood. Imagine for a moment 4500 more trips per day, coming home via Archie Moore or 78, turning on Ash. Of course, folks will have to go run errands. Will they go back to Archie Moore and take 67? Will they go back on Ash to 78? Heck no, the fastest route from that project to Albertsons, the post office, the bank and Stater Bros. Etc. is, of course, Cedar Street exit/entrance @ Summer Glen, down Davis to Montecito. And there goes the already not so safe neighborhood. AND if you are now frustrated at Montecito, Main and the Post Office - Welcome to Ramona's new nightmare.

AND ALICE TO CEDAR

This project needs to be denied as presented. no maps

Thank you,

MARK R. TIGHE,
Ingrid Tighe
1109 Alice Street
Ramona, CA 92065
760-789-8709

monran3 3-22-02

Vivian Osborn Vivian Osborn
17279 V9oorhes Ln.,
Ramona

TO: Ramona Community Planning Group
SUBJECT: TM 5250 Montecito Ranch NOI of an EIR
RE: Comments Submitted and Statement.

1. Proposed Project is based on an antiquated Specific Plan, developed in the 1978 and 1985 update of the Ramona Community Plan.
2. The Project as proposed is an URBAN DEVELOPMENT and does not comply with the Community Character Goal of the Ramona Community Plan.
(Although the Ramona Community Plan is being updated with-in the General Plan 2020 Update, the Rural Goal of Ramona is unchanged)

A. The Project requires extension of urban services(sewer and imported water) and does not permit or encourage large lots that enhance the rural character of Ramona that would allow large animal keeping, farming or ranching.

B. The Project, as designed, will completely destroy the Prime Farm Land that exists on the Montecito Ranch today.

3. The proposed project brings no benefits to the community of Ramona. 805 Properties is a Real Estate Investment Trust & is not a locally owned group. Investment benefits to an out of town trust does not share the long term financial burden that it places on our community & the County of San Diego.

A. The increase in this urban style density will negatively impact all the community infrastructure that exists today: roads, water, sewer, schools, fire & law enforcement.

B. The proposed density with the impacts to existing roads & the proposed improvements to roads are inadequate making them obsolete before they are built.

C. The proposed school site is inadequate as it is not proposed to be built by the developer, only land given. This hollow gift would require all existing residents to pay for the construction of an elementary school that would serve only the project. The projects proposed 300+ residences will create enough students to fill this unbuilt school.

D. The addition of one more URBAN style development that resembles Ryland Homes in San Diego Country Estates is unacceptable to the current Ramona Community Plan Update.

As a former member of the RCPG during 1997-2000, and as a neighbor to another recently proposed and defeated project by this same developer, I urgently request that this Planning Group cautiously scrutinize this development. Within these past six years, the RCPG has been the only vehicle for the community to raise the issue of Ramona's Community Character and the residents desire to remain unique & rural community. The RCPG has, in these past years, made great progress to inform and include the community residents in the decisions of Ramona's future during the 2020 Update. The common theme of the residents **has been the retention of Ramona as a RURAL community**. There has been NO waiver on this principle by the residents who have participated in the RCPG meetings & public workshops conducted by the RCPG for the Ramona Community Plan update.

THE MONTECITO RANCH PROJECT, AS PROPOSED, IS AN URBAN DEVELOPMENT. THE PROJECT IS NOT LOCATED WITHIN THE CURRENT URBAN DEVELPMENT AREA OF RAMONA THEREFORE THE PROPOSED PROJECT VIOLATES THE RAMONA COMMUNITY PLAN.
The 'project' EIR will prove this point or the EIR will be obviously flawed and eroneous.

Against Montecito

Ingrid

From: "Anna Merino"
To: <mulemamma@cox.net>
Cc: <amerino@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: March 23, 2002 12:26 AM
Subject: montecito ranch

Atten: Ramona Community Planning Group
From: Anna Merino
Subject: Montecito Ranch

I have lived in Ramona for 13 years and I moved out here for peace and quiet not to have a freeway behind me or have to put up with the traffice noise that 365 homes will create. I drive to Chula Vista every morning and I"am already going at a snail's pace. I live on the corner of Summer Glen and Cedar the proposal by these developers to tear up that beautiful 4,000 acres would ruin the natural habitat of the Golden Eagle and also other endangered wildlife, along with archelogical sites left by the Dieueno Indian, known as the California Indian. We also don't have the water or the electricity for 365 houses, this will drive are rates even higher. So many Californians are moving out of state because they can't afford to retire here. Don't let corporate greed ruin Ramona like it has Poway. We loyal Ramonites will fight this every step of the way.

Sincerely,

Anna Merino & Charles Galvan
1137 Summer Glen Drive
Ramona, Ca 92065

My name is Virginia Cross. 16515 Highland Valley R

I moved to Ramona with my family 3 years ago because of the appeal of livin in a rural area. We are horse people and for 20 years had often driven here to enjoy the country atmosphere & amazing vistas.

Since our arrival to live, it seems that these areas of open space & farm lands have been under constant attack by developers, who want to destroy what is so unique to Ramona — making their fortunes on our loss.

I am not going to comment on the appearanc of this current plan in front of us, because it will not achieve anything positive. However if this and other schemes like it are allowed, Ramona will fast become surrounde by stucco & pavement; much like Poway.

The reason people like us drive here for 20 years, will be forever lost.

Please leave the open spaces, to be preserved where wildlife can flourish & we mean all be renewed by its beauty!

Please vote this proposal down others like it.

Thanks

Jeff Lachine
Woodhes Ln.

I'm strongly opposed to the Montecito Ranch development as currently proposed. This plan conflicts with spirit of Ramona's community character, and Community Plan, in several key areas:

1. Density is distinctly urban with the planned clustering on narrow lots that have little useable space. The pads are very small and open space restrictions reduce the useable area to not much more than ½ acre. This precludes any ag or large animal keeping activities. Setbacks are typical of those found in urban lots. The resulting "spacious subdivision" is NOT consistent with the general area, as claimed by the applicant.

2. Nothing in this plan addresses the cumulative impact on the local roads. We're not prepared for the increased traffic. Existing residents shouldn't be forced to accept it as "inevitable".

3. Nothing in this plan covers the true costs of adding capacity to educate the students it would force into the local schools. It's a fact that building fees and property taxes do not provide enough dollars. Donating a site does not go far enough.

4. Over 60% of the 935 acres "consists of sensitive and biological resources". There's no way to mitigate the effects of developing these areas. There's no way to replace the 100 acres of prime ag soils that would be lost. Makes more sense to subtract them from the total and consider low density development of the remainder. This might result in 65 four acre home sites.

Send a strong message to the County that this project is not consistent with Ramona's community character.

Gwen Nowrick

17228 Voorhes Lane, Ramona, CA 92065

Ramona Community Planning Group
P.O. Box
Ramona, CA 92065

RE: SP 01-001; TM 5250; Log No. 01-09-013; Montecito Ranch Specific plan.

SIZE: This project encompasses an area equal to the entire Ramona downtown. It is HUGE, and the impacts to Ramona will be equally huge. I believe the magnitude of this project is completely out of scale with the town of Ramona.

TRAFFIC: Montecito Ranch proposes 358 houses in an area of poor access. It will dump another 4,500 trips per day onto Hwy 78, Montecito Road and Highland Valley Road, further aggravating Ramona's traffic nightmare. We know from past experience that the developers have no responsibility for any road improvements save those made immediately adjacent to the property. Feeder road size, condition and adequacy, turn lanes, lights, etc. are "not his problem" and will not be addressed.

URBAN SPRAWL: This project is in direct conflict with the County's land use goals to retain the rural character of non-urban lands and encourage the continuance and expansion of agriculture. The project also conflicts with the overall goal of the Land Use Element to direct growth to the urbanized areas and to retain the rural setting of the remaining areas of the unincorporated County.

COMMUNITY CHARACTER: Montecito Ranch looks just like Scripps Ranch - rows of pink boxes crammed in side to side. The plan calls for privacy fencing of lots (Pg. 31), entry gates and "monumentation" (pps 29-31).

The standards set for space as outlined in their prospectus are an insult:

> **"Side yards between individual homes should be increased to promote privacy. It is intended that these areas recreate the ambiance of a small town with a minimum twenty feet between structures" (Pg. 42)**

20 feet is barely wider than a driveway, and certainly doesn't promote any sort of rural lifestyle that I recognize. It may be an an accepted standard elsewhere in the County, but is not the standard and is certainly NOT the norm in Ramona!

The limited equestrian trails provided for in the project are there as a palliative, and are ineffectual window dressing calculated to make the project more palatable to local horse owners.

Regardless of the developer's honeyed rhetoric, this is just the latest version of high density urban housing proposed for Ramona. Others have spoken before me and more will speak after me on why this project and others like it don't belong in Ramona. I urge you to listen to the residents of Ramona when we ask you to vote against Montecito Ranch.

22 MAR 02

MONTE CITO RANCH SITE

ART VII

1. Potential of Degradation of Level of Service of affected roadways should also include STATE highway in addition to county roads, i.e. Hwy 67 + Hwy 78

G H Eastland
2457 S. OAK ROAD
RAMONA, CA 92065