MONTECITO RANCH

APPENDIX D

RESOURCE PROTECTION STUDY

for the

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SP01-001; TM 5250RPL[6]; P04-045;
LOG NO. 01-09-013; SCH NO. 2002021132

MAY 2008

Information for the Reader

This technical report analyzes Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO)-related elements associated with construction and operation of the Montecito Ranch Project. The reader should note that refinement of the location of a Circulation Element roadway (SA 330) between Montecito Road and SR 67 is included as a Circulation Element change in the project description provided in the Montecito Ranch Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Because construction of this segment of the roadway is not anticipated as this time (buildout of the roadway segment will be completed by another entity in the future), and does not comprise part of the Montecito Ranch Project, this report does not contain analysis regarding the segment of SA 330 south of Montecito Road. For readers interested in potential effects (all assessed as less than significant) associated with the relocated road segment, please refer to Subchapter 3.1, Land Use, and Section 5.8.6, Extension of SA 330 Design Scenario Alternative, of the EIR. When construction is contemplated, impacts will be confirmed. Construction of this roadway would be completed by others.

RESOURCE PROTECTION STUDY
FOR
MONTECITO RANCH
TM 5250

PREPARED FOR:

Montecito Ranch, LLC
402 W. Broadway, Suite 1320
San Diego, CA 92101-3542

PREPARED BY:

R·E·C
Consultants, Inc.

2442 Second Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 232-9200

February 2008

Elyssa Robertson,
Principal Biologist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction

The following report summarizes information from a variety of sources to assess whether or not Montecito Ranch complies with the County of San Diego's Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) (9842). The sources for the report include the Biological Technical Report for Montecito Ranch (REC, 2008), the Archaeological Report for Montecito Ranch (Heritage Resources 2008) and a slope and floodplain analysis (Stevens Cresto 2007). The County adopted the RPO in 1991 to protect natural and other important resources from direct impacts caused by development. RPO regulates the following resources:

- Steep Slopes
- Sensitive Habitat
- Wetlands
- Wetland Buffer Areas
- Floodways and floodplain fringes
- Significant prehistoric and Historic Sites

The RPO provides development controls for those resources listed above within the County of San Diego. The RPO requires that prior to the approval of the following discretionary applications, a resource protection study must be completed and findings must be made to determine if the development proposed by the application is consistent with the provisions of the RPO. The following discretionary applications require RPO approval:

- Tentative parcel maps
- Tentative maps
- Revised tentative parcel maps and revised tentative maps

(Reviews shall exclude areas unaffected by the proposed revisions)

- Expired tentative parcel maps and expired tentative maps
- Rezones (Excluding those applying the Sensitive Resource Area designator and those which have been initiated by the County)
- Major Use Permits

Major Use Permit modifications (Review shall exclude areas unaffected by the proposed Modifications)

- Certificates of Compliance filed pursuant to San Diego County code sections 81.616.1 or 81.616.2 of this code (excluding condominium conversions)
- Site Plans (excluding those Statutorily or Categorically Exempt from review under the CEQA and those required by a Sensitive Resource Area Designator)
- Administrative Permits (excluding those Statutorily or Categorically Exempt from review under CEQA and those for clearing)
- Vacations of Open Space Easements

The report details the resources protected by the RPO as it relates to the Montecito Ranch project and how the project conforms to SEC 86.604 “Permitted Uses and Development Criteria” set forth in the RPO.

2.0 Project Description

The proposed Montecito Ranch project (proposed project) is located in the unincorporated community of Ramona in the county of San Diego, approximately 20 miles northeast of the city of San Diego (Figures 1 and 2). The project site is located approximately one mile northwest of the Ramona Town Center. Pine Street, which also serves as state Route (SR) 78, borders the eastern project boundary, while Montecito Way extends southerly from the southern project boundary. The project also includes off-site roadway improvements. Immediate surrounding land uses consist of semi-rural and estate residential development to the north, east, and south, and the Lemurian Fellowship religious facility and orchards to the northwest. The 1,027-acre Davis SPA adjoins the Montecito Ranch SPA on the south and west. The Davis Ranch property was purchased by the Nature Conservancy for the preservation. The Ramona Airport lies approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site.

The Proposed Project would include the development of a rural residential community consisting of 417 single-family residential units on lots ranging in size from approximately 0.5 to 1.8 acres. Horses would be allowed within lots 1 through 30 in the eastern portion of the site. The Project would dedicate land for various public improvements including a historic park site, local park site (fully developed), charter high school site, and open space. The northern portion of the historic park site includes the historic Montecito Ranch House, which would be renovated by the proposed project. The southern portion of the historic park site would include equestrian staging area, as well as act as an overflow parking area for the parks and school sites. The equestrian facilities would include several 15 feet by 15 feet horse pens, an 80-foot diameter round pen, an animal wash down area, hitching posts, 100 feet by 150 feet arena with bleacher seating, a picnic area, and parking (including horse trailer parking). This area would connect to the regional trail system.

The Proposed Project includes two wastewater management options. Wastewater Management Option 1, Off-site Sewer Connection, would include the extension of a sewer force main off-site to connect to the Santa Maria Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP). Wastewater Management Option 2 is an on-site wastewater reclamation facility (WRF) to treat all on-site wastewater and utilize the reclaimed water to irrigate on-site public landscaped areas. Option 1 would result in a total of 573.8 acres of dedicated open space within the Project site and Option 2 would result in 549.1 acres of dedicated open space due to the space requirements associated with the WRF. Since a final determination as to the most appropriate approach to treatment of Project wastewater has not yet been made, Wastewater Management Option 1, Off-site Sewer Connection, is

addressed equally with Wastewater Management Option 2, WRF. The Project also includes off-site roadway and water improvements to support the SPA development. The proposed off-site roadway improvements include e widening existing segments of Ash Street, Montecito Way and Montecito Road.

The overall objective of the Project is to provide an environmentally sensitive, residential community compatible with the rural character of the surrounding area while preserving existing natural open space (including the Ramona Grasslands), landforms, and topography. A 220.5-acre biological open space area has been set aside in the southwestern portion of the SPA property. Approximately 353.3 additional acres of the site would be designated as open space under Wastewater Management Option 1 (328.6 acres under Option 2), the majority of which would serve as additional biological open space. Following Project implementation, a total of 573.8 acres of open space (61 percent of the site), including 558.2 acres of biological preserve, would exist within the SPA boundaries under Option 1. Option 2 would reduce the biological preserve by 24.7 acres. The open space areas would include 11.1 acres (3.8 miles) of proposed equestrian/pedestrian trails. In addition, 3.1 acres (2.3 miles) of multi-purpose trails would be located within roadway rights-of-way on site and 1.7 miles of trails throughout the residential lots. Much of the designated open space area also would serve as biological open space preserve. These open space areas would include sensitive biological habitat, important archaeological resources, steep slopes, buffer areas, and other environmentally sensitive areas to create viable wildlife corridors and linkages. Development and brush management areas would not be included within the biological open space preserve. The Project also would include 4 Homeowners' Association (HOA) maintenance lots, totaling 7.9 acres. No development is proposed for these lots; therefore, they are not included in the acreage for the development footprint. Because brush management would occur within the HOA maintenance lots, these lots are not included in the on-site biological open space preserve.

The project is composed of two separate units. Unit 1 would consist of 243 single-family residential units and Unit 2 would include 174 single-family residential units. Table 1 summarizes the proposed uses of the land within the Project site. The Proposed Project would fully develop an 8.3-acre local park site and dedicate land for an 11.9-acre historic park site surrounding the existing historic Montecito Ranch House, as well as create an integrated system of multi-purpose trails. The proposed project would include renovation of the Montecito Ranch House. The house would be dedicated to the County or cooperating group for preservation and maintenance as an interpretive center, community center, or museum. The historic park site would include an equestrian staging area, as described above. Land for a 10.6-acre charter high school site also would be dedicated as part of the Proposed Project. Under Wastewater Management Option 2, the Proposed Project also would include a 0.9-acre WRF that can accommodate 110,000 gallons of wastewater per day, five storage ponds on 6.9 acres, and a 16.9-acre spray field.

The proposed Montecito Ranch Road would include two lanes within a 118-foot right-of-way from Ash Street at the eastern site boundary to Lot 392 within Unit 2. From Lot 392 to the southern property boundary at the terminus of Montecito Way, Montecito Ranch Road would be a two-lane road within an 80-foot right-of-way. Bike lanes would be provided on both sides of the roadway. In addition, an eight-foot-wide meandering trail would be constructed within the right-of-way on the north side of Montecito Ranch Road along its entire length. All other on-site residential streets would be two-lane roadways within private road rights-of-way with County maintenance easements.

To accommodate Project traffic and improve traffic flow in the vicinity, the Project would widen segments of Ash Street, Montecito Way and Montecito Road. In addition, to mitigate Project-related traffic impacts under Off-site Roadway Option 1, improvements would be required to the intersections of Ash Street/Pine Street (SR 78), Main Street (SR 67)/Pine Street (SR 78), Montecito Road/Montecito Way, and Montecito Road/Main Street (SR 67), SR67/Highland Valley Rd./Dye Rd. and SR67/Archie Moore Rd.

The Proposed Project would require construction of off-site utility improvements to provide water service to the Project. One approximately 4,000-foot (0.75-mile) long, 12-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) water line would be extended northerly along Montecito Way to the Project site from the existing 24-inch main in Montecito Road. A second 12-inch PVC water line would be extended from the existing 14-inch line in Pine Street, approximately 4,000 feet (0.75 mile) westerly within Ash Street to the Project site. The proposed off-site connections would be installed during construction of the proposed improvements to Montecito Way and Ash Street. In addition, a water storage tank would be installed just west of the Project site within an adjacent property. This tank would hold 1.26 million gallons under Wastewater Management Option 1 and 0.91 million gallons under Option 2. (The decrease under Option 2 is due to decreased use of potable water for irrigation.) A pipeline would connect the water storage tank to the proposed pipeline within Montecito Way. This pipeline would be installed under a 20-foot-wide access road to the water storage tank. The water storage tank and associated pipelines and roadways would disturb approximately 3.9 acres (1.7 acres onsite, and 2.2 acres offsite). The Proposed Project also would include the installation of a water booster pump station on a 10,000-square foot (0.2-acre) lot at the northwestern corner of the Montecito Road/Montecito Way intersection.

Under Wastewater Management Option 1, wastewater management for the Project would be provided by Ramona Municipal Water District and off-site sewer improvements would be required. Proposed off-site sewer improvements would consist of a sewer force main from the southwestern corner of the Project site within the Montecito Way, Montecito Rd. and Kalbaugh St., where the pipeline would connect to an existing facility, where the Santa Maria WTP located on Sawday Street, west of the Ramona Town Center, where the wastewater from

the Proposed Project would be treated, if capacity becomes available at the WTP.

Under Wastewater Management Option 2, all wastewater generated by the Proposed Project would be treated at the proposed on-site wastewater reclamation facility, which would accommodate 110,000 gallons per day of wastewater. At Project build out, an estimated 60 percent of the reclaimed water generated by the wastewater reclamation facility would be used for irrigation of the proposed on-site parks, landscaped areas along project roadways, and future school, with the remaining reclaimed water (approximately 40 percent) being distributed over the proposed 16.9-acre spray field. Reclaimed water distribution pipelines would be installed within project roadways to deliver the reclaimed water to the targeted on-site uses.

Standard measures are proposed during both the on-and off-site grading and construction phases to reduce environmental effects and impacts to air quality, erosion and water quality. The environmental design measures include the following types of considerations:

- Construction activities would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday excluding public holidays
- Conformance with short-term (construction) erosion control and water quality regulatory requirements through the implementation of an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to address issues such as control of erosion and hazardous materials (e.g. vehicle fuels)
- Conformance with long-term water quality regulatory requirements through the implementation of an approved Strom Water Management Plan (SWMP) and use of measures such as detention basins, biofilters (i.e. vegetated swales), landscaping and energy dissipaters
- Multiple applications of water during grading between bulldozer/scraper passes
- Paving or chip sealing stabilization of internal roadways after completion of grading
- Use of sweepers or water trucks to remove “track-out” at any point of public street access
- Installation of detention basins
- Boulder stabilization
- Conformance with fire prevention requirements.

Table 1. Permit Requirements and Approving Agencies

Discretionary Approval/Permit	Approving Agency
Specific Plan Vesting Tentative Map 5250 Site Plan Grading Permit Street Vacations Execution of Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate right-of-way Major Use Permit for Montecito Ranch Development Major Use Permit for WRF (under Wastewater Management Option 2 only) Master Reclamation Plan for WRF (under Wastewater Management Option 2 only) Parcel Rezone (A70 to S88) County General Plan Amendments County Trails Master Plan Amendment Roadway Design Speed Exception for Ash Street (35 instead of 40 mph) RPO Exemption	County of San Diego
4(d) Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service California Department of Fish and Game
Encroachment Permit (for Pine Street and Main Street improvements and utilities connections)	Caltrans
Annexation to RMWD for sewer service (under Wastewater Management Option 1 only)	County of San Diego Ramona Municipal Water District LAFCO
NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges	State Water Resources Control Board
NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit Compliance	County of San Diego California Regional Water Quality Control Board
General Waste Discharge Permit for Groundwater Extraction Waste Discharges (if necessary) Waste Discharge Permit for WRF	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Water Treatment Device Certification for WRF	California Department of Health Services
Emergency generators for pump stations and WRF	Air Quality Management Board
Section 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement	California Department of Fish and Game
Section 404 Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Section 401 Certification	California Regional Water Quality Control Board

3.0 RPO Section 86.604. "PERMITTED USES AND DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA"

3.1 Wetlands

Wetland habitats, in general, are considered sensitive biological resources because they have been dramatically reduced in San Diego County and across the nation. Due to the regional and national loss of wetland habitats, resource agencies have a "no net loss policy" for wetlands. Wetland habitats are important because they have high levels of food and nutrients, high wildlife diversity, and they are a valuable water source for wildlife in the arid climate of southern California.

Wetland habitats are considered habitats with very high value in accordance with the RPO. Wetlands are defined by the RPO as:
(1) Lands having one or more of the following attributes:

(aa.) At least periodically, the land supports a predominance of hydrophytes (plants whose habitat is water or very wet places);

(bb). The substratum is predominantly undrained hydric soil; or

(cc). An ephemeral or perennial stream is present, whose substratum is predominately non-soil and such lands contribute substantially to the biological functions or values of wetlands in the drainage system.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) above, the following shall not be considered "wetlands":

(aa) lands which have attribute(s) specified in paragraph (1) solely due to man-made structures (e.g. culverts, ditches, road crossings, or agricultural ponds), provided that the Director of Panning and Land use determines that they:
- (i) have negligible biological function or value as wetlands;
- (ii) Are small and geographically isolated from other wetland systems;
- (iii) Are not Vernal Pools; and,
- (iv) Do not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland dependent sensitive species.

(bb) Lands that have been degraded by past legal land disturbance activities, to the point that they meet the following criteria as determined by the Director o Planning and Land Use:

- (i.) Have negligible biological function or value as wetlands even if restored to the extent feasible; and,

(ii.) Do not have substantial or locally important populations of wetland dependent sensitive species.

The biological technical report for the Montecito Ranch project identifies the wetland areas that are subject to the RPO (Figure 3). These areas have been confirmed by County staff in the field. Three drainages and one agriculture pond has been identified as RPO wetland. One of these supports oak woodland habitat while the other two are primarily scoured channels. Each of the RPO defined wetlands have been avoided with the proposed project.

RPO Finding of Conformance:

Onsite conformance:

The proposed project avoids all RPO defined wetlands onsite. These wetlands are avoided in accordance with Section 86.603 (c) (1), which states "Apply open space easements to portions of the project site that contain sensitive lands". The project proposes to put all RPO wetlands and buffers in an open space easement as shown on the map. The RPO states that "permitted uses in wetland areas shall be restricted to the following uses, not involving grading, filling, construction or placement of structures: aquaculture activities, scientific research, educational uses, recreational uses, or wetland restoration projects. The Montecito Ranch project does not propose any aquaculture, scientific research, educational uses, or recreational uses within any RPO defined wetland. Some restoration activities may occur, as allowed within these drainages to offset impact due to offsite roadway construction. These restoration efforts will be need to be reviewed and approved by the County as part of a Final Revegetation/Restoration Mitigation Plan.

Offsite Conformance:

Offsite Roadway improvements will impact wetlands where the existing roadway crosses Santa Maria Creek. Impacts to this area, in the form of widening the existing bridge across the wetland, are allowed under Section 86.604 (a) (5) of the RPO which states:

SEC 86.604. (a)

(5) Crossings of wetland for roads, driveways or trails/pathways dedicated and improved to the limitations and standards under the County Trails Program, that are necessary to access adjacent lands, when all of the following conditions are met:

(aa) There is no feasible alternative that avoids the wetland;

(bb) The crossings are limited to the minimum number feasible;

(cc) The crossings are located and designed in such a way as to cause the least impact to environmental resources, minimize impacts to sensitive species

and prevent barriers to wildlife movement (e.g. crossing widths shall be the minimum feasible and wetlands shall be bridged where feasible).

(dd) The least damaging construction methods are utilized (e.g., staging areas shall be located outside of sensitive areas, work will not be performed during the sensitive avian breeding season, noise attenuation measures shall be included and hours of operation shall be limited so as to comply with all applicable ordinances and to avoid impacts to sensitive resources);

(ee) The applicant shall prepare an analysis of whether the crossing could feasibly serve adjoining properties and thereby result in minimizing the number of additional crossings required by adjacent development; and

(ff) There must be no net loss of wetland and any impacts to wetlands shall be mitigated at a 3:1 (this shall include a minimum 1:1 creation component, while restoration/enhancement of existing wetlands may be used to make up the remaining requirements for a total 3:1 ratio).

(***aa) There is no feasible alternative that avoids the wetland***: Six different roadway alignments were reviewed. Each of these other alignments are shown on Figure 8. These alignments were determined to be more environmentally damaging than the alignment proposed here. A variety of different road locations were reviewed as past design alternatives (see attached Figure 8. These included: Alternative 1) extending Montecito Ranch Road west toward Rangeland Road or Alternative 2) widening existing Montecito Way and Montecito Road without extending Montecito Way to Main Street (SR 67). Alternative 1 was determined environmentally detrimental since it would bisect the Ramona Grasslands and potentially induce additional development in the grasslands area. The proposed widening of Montecito Ranch Road meets the requirements of this finding because it is not possible to avoid the wetland, but would be have the least environmentally impact. The remaining four alternatives were reviewed and rejected due to either significant biological impacts (riparian woodland and/or vernal pool impacts) or impacts to residential neighborhoods.

(***bb) The crossings are limited to the minimum number feasible:*** Rather than cross multiple drainages, the widening of the existing bridge over Santa Maria Creek will minimize impacts.

(cc) The crossings are located and designed in such a way as to cause the least impact to environmental resources, minimize impacts to sensitive

species and prevent barriers to wildlife movement (e.g. crossing widths shall be the minimum feasible and wetlands shall be bridged where feasible): Montecito Road widening proposes widening and improvements to the existing bridge within the current right of way easement, thereby not creating any additional impacts beyond those that were already anticipated for this road. The bridge will be widened to 52 feet. Widening the existing bridge would not create a barrier for wildlife movement. The current bridge does not impede wildlife movement. Large mammal movement requires a minimum of 6 feet high to adequately allow for deer and other large mammals to traverse. Wildlife movement through the area is not expected to be further impeded beyond current conditions.

(dd) The least damaging construction methods are utilized (e.g., staging areas shall be located outside of sensitive areas, work shall not be performed during the sensitive avian breeding season, noise attenuation measures shall be included and hours of operation shall be limited so as to comply with all applicable ordinances and to avoid impacts to sensitive resources): Construction methods including staging areas and hours of operation will be finalized prior to construction. At a minimum construction plans should include avoidance of construction during the bird breeding season, the limits of work will be flagged and monitored by a biologist during construction, staging areas should not be placed in sensitive areas, construction hours should comply with the County of San Diego noise ordinances, etc.

(ee) The applicant shall prepare an analysis of whether the crossing could feasibly serve adjoining properties and thereby result in minimizing the number of additional crossings required by adjacent development: It is unlikely that additional roadways would be constructed in the area. This will eliminate the need for additional creek crossings.

(ff) There must be no net loss of wetland and any impacts to wetlands shall be mitigated at a 3:1 (this shall include a minimum 1:1 creation component, while restoration/enhancement of existing wetlands may be used to make up the remaining requirements for a total 3:1 ratio). The project will not result in a net loss of wetland habitat. Mitigation will be conducted at a 1:1 creation ratio and a 2:1 enhancement ratio on Montecito Ranch. Creation will occur west of the existing ranch house adjacent to an already approved wetland mitigation plan.

3.2 Wetland Buffer Areas

Wetland buffer areas are defined by RPO as “Lands which provide a buffer area of an appropriate size to protect the environmental and functional habitat values of the wetland, or which are integrally important in supporting the full range of the wetland and adjacent upland biological community.”

Buffer widths shall be 50 to 200 feet from the edge of the wetland as appropriate based on the above factors. Where oak woodland occurs adjacent to the wetland, the wetland buffer shall include the entirety of the oak habitat (not to exceed 200 feet in width).

Findings of Conformance:

The proposed project provides a 50 foot buffer area around unvegetated RPO wetlands and up to 200 feet around vegetated RPO wetland areas. Although these drainages are shown within a habitat type on Figure 3, they are predominantly unvegetated, scoured drainages. Where an RPO wetland occurs with adjacent oak woodland, the buffer is extended to encompass the woodland, not to exceed 200 feet. Based on Figure 3, no impact to RPO defined wetland buffers is proposed. The RPO does allow impacts to wetland buffers in the form of (1) improvements necessary to protect adjacent wetlands and (2) all uses permitted in wetland areas, however, no impacts to RPO wetland buffer areas are proposed.

The creek at the existing Montecito Road bridge is surrounded by residential development and therefore, no new buffer can be created at this location when the bridge is widened.

3.3 Floodways

A floodway is defined in the RPO as "All that land, as determined by the Director of Public Works, which meets the following criteria:

a. The floodway shall include all areas necessary to pass the 100 year flood without increasing the water surface elevation more than 1 foot […].
b. The floodway shall include all land necessary to convey a ten year flood without structural improvements.
c. To avoid creating erosion and the need for channelization, rip-rap or concrete lining, the floodway will not be further reduced in width when the velocity at the floodway boundary is six feet per second or greater.
d. Floodways are determined by removing equal conveyance (capacity for passing flood flow) from each side unless another criterion controls."

The RPO regulations state: "The development of permanent structures for human habitation or as a place of work shall not be permitted in a floodway. Use permitted in a floodway shall be limited to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses provided, however, that no use shall be permitted which will substantially harm the environmental values of a particular floodway area. Mineral resource extraction shall be permitted subject to an approved Major Use Permit and Reclamation Plan, provided that mitigation measures are required which produce any net gain in the functional wetlands and riparian habitat."

Modifications to the floodway must meet all of the following criteria:

(1) Concrete or rip-rap flood control channels are allowed only where findings are made that completion of the channel is necessary to protect existing buildings from a current flooding problem. Buildings

constructed after the enactment of this Ordinance shall not be the basis for permitting such channels.

(2) Modification will not unduly accelerate the velocity of water so as to create a condition which would increase erosion (and related downstream sedimentation) or would be detrimental to the health and safety of persons or property or adversely affect wetlands or riparian habitat.

(3) In high velocity streams where it is necessary to protect existing houses and other structures, minimize stream scour, or avoid an increase in the transport of stream sediment to downstream wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat areas, grade control structures, and other erosion control techniques, including the use of rip rap, that are designed to be compatible with the environmental setting of the river, may be permitted. The use of rip rap shall be allowed only when there is no other less environmentally damaging alternative feasible.

RPO Findings of Conformance:

The Montecito Ranch project is north of the Santa Maria Creek Valley and is not subject to any floodplains as identified on the County of San Diego floodplain maps (Figure 4). A Preliminary Floodplain Evaluation Form initialed by Yosmia Johnson (County Public Works) on 11/04/02 is also included (Appendix A). Because the Montecito Ranch property is not with in an RPO-defined floodway, no impacts or modifications to a floodway will occur in accordance with the RPO.

The proposed Montecito Road bridge widening will cross the 100 year flood plain and floodway of Santa Maria Creek. . Although the road will encroach into the floodplain, the proposed widening of the existing roadway has been designed to not encumber flood flows in the area.

(1) ***Concrete or rip-rap flood control channels are allowed only where findings are made that completion of the channel is necessary to protect existing buildings from a current flooding problem. Buildings constructed after the enactment of this Ordinance shall not be the basis for permitting such channels:*** The proposed offsite road improvements do not propose flood control channels as part of the bridge widening.

(2) ***Modification will not unduly accelerate the velocity of water so as to create a condition which would increase erosion (and related downstream sedimentation) or would be detrimental to the health and safety of persons or property or adversely affect wetlands or riparian habitat:*** The crossing may require placement of support columns within the floodway; however the bridge will be required to be designed to not allow for undue downstream scour, erosion, sedimentation or impoundment.

(3) ***In high velocity streams where it is necessary to protect existing houses and other structures, minimize stream scour, or avoid an increase in the transport of stream sediment to downstream wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat areas, grade control structures, and other erosion control techniques, including the use of rip rap, that are designed to be compatible with the environmental setting of the river, may be permitted. The use of rip rap shall be allowed only when there is no other less environmentally damaging alternative feasible***. Based on the current conceptual plans, no use of rip rap is proposed. The bridge columns will be assessed in the final design to ensure that significant additional scour or increase in sediment downstream does not occur.

3.4 Floodplain Fringe

RPO defines floodplain fringe as the area within the floodplain that is not in the floodway. The RPO Section 86.604 (d) defines allowed uses within the floodplain fringe:

a. Fill shall be limited to that necessary to elevate the structure above the elevation of the floodway and to permit minimal functional use of the structure (e.g., fill for access ramps and drainage). If fill is placed in the floodplain fringe, the new bank of the creek shall be landscaped to blend with the natural vegetation of the stream and enhance the natural edge of the stream. *No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. Improvements to and widening of Montecito Road meets the minimum requirements of allowed fill to elevate the bridge. .*
b. Any development below the elevation of the 100 year flood shall be capable of withstanding periodic flooding. *No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. The only allowed use within the 100 year flood associated with improvements to Montecito Road will be the support structures for the widened bridge.*
c. The design of the development shall incorporate the findings and recommendation of a site specific hydrologic study to assure that the development: (i) will not cause significant adverse water resource impacts related to quality or quantity of flow or increase in peak flow to downstream wetlands, lagoons and other sensitive habitat lands; and (ii) neither significantly increases nor contributes to downstream bank erosion and sedimentation of wetlands, lagoons or other sensitive habitat lands*. No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. Improvements to Montecito Road will be designed based on the current hydrology study.*
d. Lot configurations shall be designed in such a manner as to minimize encroachment into the floodplain. The proposed development shall be

set back from the floodway boundary a distance equal to 15% of the floodway width (but not to exceed 100 feet), in order to leave an appropriate buffer area adjacent to the floodway. The setback may be greater if required by Paragraph f. *No lots fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. Improvements to Montecito Road is a perpendicular impact to a crossing and therefore, setbacks are infeasible.*

Following review of a site-specific flood analysis, the floodplain setback required by this paragraph may be reduced by the Director of Planning and Land Use or the applicable hearing body, upon making all of appropriate findings. However since the proposed Montecito Ranch site does not include any flood plain fringe these findings of floodplain setback are not applicable.

e. ***Where appropriate, flowage and/or open space easements shall be used to ensure future development will not occur in the floodplain***. *No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. The offsite Montecito Road improvement is the widening of an existing bridge within an existing easement and would cross one drainage. Each of these options do not propose to allow for future development.* .

f. ***In areas where the Director of Public Works has determined that the potential for erosion or sedimentation in the floodplain is significant, all proposed development shall be set back from the floodway so that it is outside the Erosion/Sedimentation Hazard Area shown on County floodplain maps. Development will only be allowed in the Erosion/sedimentation Hazard Area when the Director of Public Works approves a special study demonstrating that adequate protection can be achieved in a manner that is compatible with the natural characteristics of the river.*** *No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. No fill is currently proposed for the floodway of Santa Maria Creek for the Montecito Road widening.*

g. ***If the subject floodplain fringe land also constitutes wetlands, wetland buffer areas, steep slope lands, sensitive habitat lands or significant prehistoric or historic site lands, the use restrictions herein applicable to such area shall also apply.*** No fill, structures, or other impacts are proposed to occur in a floodplain fringe on the Montecito Ranch property. *Findings for Sensitive habitat lands and wetland buffers are provided herein. Offsite road improvement will not impact steep slope or significant pre-historic/historic lands.*

3.5 Steep Slope Lands

The County of San Diego RPO defines steep slope lands as “All lands having a slope with natural gradient of 25% or greater and a minimum rise of 50 feet,

unless said land has been substantially disturbed by previous legal grading. The minimum rise shall be measured vertically from the toe of slope to the top of slope within the project boundary."

For all types of projects, the RPO designates the maximum encroachment permitted into steep slope lands. In accordance with the RPO, a slope analysis has been prepared by a qualified civil engineering company for the Montecito Ranch project. Digital topography was utilized to create a slope map depicting various slope categories within the project site (Figures 5a and 5b) (Stevens Cresto, 2007).

In addition, the RPO includes the following requirements with respect to steep slope lands:

a. Density Formula. When a parcel is located within a plan designation which bases lot size on slopes, the number of lots and/or number of dwelling units created shall be constrained by the following formula per the RPO:

Acres in slopes less than 15% divided by the minimum lot size permitted by General Plan
+ Acres in slopes of 15%/ less than 25% divided by the minimum lot size permitted by the General Plan,
+ Acres in sloes of 25% / less than 50% divided by minimum lot size permitted by the General Plan
+Acres in slopes of 50% or greater divided by the minimum lot size permitted by the General Plan
= Maximum number of lots and/or dwelling units allowable.

A Planned Residential Development, lot area averaging, or cluster development shall be required to use the density allowed a standard subdivision using this density formula.

Figures 5a and 5b depict the steep slope analysis of the proposed project. The following table summarizes the acres of slopes for Montecito Ranch as defined in the RPO.

Table 2. Slope Analysis Breakdown.	
Less than 15%	600.55 acres
15% and greater up to 25%	185.14 acres
25% and greater up to 50%	133.37 acres
50% and greater	15.94 acres

The project consists of 935 acres with a total steep slope area of 102.62 acres. The following is the RPO density formula applied to the Montecito Ranch project:

Table 3. Density Calculation.	
600.55 acres / 2 acres =	300.28
185.14 acres / 2 acres =	92.57
133.37 acres / 4 acres =	33.34
15.94 acres / 4 acres =	3.99

TOTAL: **430 dwelling units** = Maximum number of lots or dwelling units allowed.

Because the project is a clustered development, lot averaging for the slope analysis is used. The proposed 417 units is within the RPO allowed 430 dwelling units.

Based on the Slope Encroachment Allowance (RPO), 10% maximum encroachment allowance is given for lots having 75% or less of steep slope lands.

RPO Finding of Conformance:

The project consists of 935.20 acres with a total RPO-defined sensitive steep slope area of approximately 102.6 acres. All of the steep slopes would be preserved in their natural state in open space with development of the proposed Montecito Ranch project. In addition the allowable density of 430 units based on the density calculation is met through the proposed project design of 417 units. Therefore, the project is consistent with RPO steep slope policies.

There are no steep slopes as defined by the RPO within the Ash St., Montecito Way and Montecito Road widening footprints.

The proposed offsite water tank and access road will require encroachment into steep slopes. This is a requirement of the design of the water tank, since water tanks need to be of such an elevation as to create adequate water pressure through gravity flow. Private and public utility systems are allowed on steep slopes per section 86.604 (e) (2) (bb) (iii). However, the tank and access have been designed to minimize encroachment onto the steep slopes.

3.6 Sensitive Habitat Lands

Sensitive lands are defined by the RPO as:

> "Land which supports unique vegetation communities, or the habitats of rare or endangered species or sub-species of animals or plants as defined by Section 15380 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 Cal. Admin. Code Section 15000 et seq.). Sensitive habitat lands includes the area which is necessary to support a viable population of any of the above species in perpetuity, or which is

critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor."

"Unique vegetation community' refers to associations of plant species which are rare or substantially depleted due to development. These may contain rare or endangered species, but other species may be included because they are unusual or limited due to a number of factors, for example: a) they are only found in the San Diego region; b) they are a local representative of a species not generally found in San Diego County; c) they are outstanding examples of the community type as identified by the California Department of Fish and Game listing of community associations."

Development, grading, grubbing, clearing or any other activity or use damaging to sensitive habitat lands shall be prohibited. The authority considering an application listed in article III, Section 1 of the RPO, may allow development when all feasible measures necessary to protect and preserve the sensitive habitat lands are required as a condition of permit approval and where mitigation provides an equal or greater benefit to the affected species.

Several sensitive habitats occur on the Montecito Ranch project site. These include oak woodlands (open Engelmann oak woodland, dense Engelmann oak woodland, and Southern Coast Live oak woodland), wetlands (riparian scrub, disturbed wetlands), Diegan coastal sage scrub, non-native grasslands and chaparral (chamise chaparral and southern mixed chaparral) (Figure 3).

Mitigation for significant impacts is proposed through onsite preservation of a variety of habitat types. Approximately 317.66 acres of habitat will remain on Montecito Ranch after project impacts and already obligated mitigation is established (Figure 6).

RPO Finding of Conformance:

Sensitive habitat lands include southern coast live oak Riparian woodland, Open Engelmann oak woodland, dense Engelmann oak woodland, Southern Riparian scrub, Disturbed wetlands, and Diegan coastal sage scrub. In addition, offsite habitat considered an RPO sensitive habitat type includes riparian woodland in Santa Maria Creek. Table 4 provides the total acreage of each of these habitat types, the proposed impacts and the proposed preservation acreage. Encroachment into these lands have been avoided or minimized. Every effort was made to concentrate development in the least sensitive habitat types while still achieving the goals of the project and the design standards for roadways. Therefore some encroachment into RPO sensitive lands both onsite and offsite was required.

Protection and Preservation measures for the sensitive habitat lands have been included in the project design. This includes clustering development to the greatest extent practical in the least environmentally sensitive habitat, providing signs alerting the public to the sensitive nature of the preserve lands, placing all remaining land in a biological open space easement and implementing a Resource Management Plan in perpetuity for the long term protection of the biological resources in open space.

Mitigation for impacts to sensitive habitat lands include ratios at a minimum of 2:1 for the coastal sage scrub and 3:1 for wetland habitat. This mitigation will be achieved through preservation measures discussed above either on the Montecito Ranch site, at a pre-approved mitigation bank or at other lands as approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use. Table 4 summarizes the mitigation requirements for this project.

Table 4.
Montecito Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Habitat Type	Total Acres Onsite	Direct Impacts	Acres Not Impacted	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Required	Acres Not Allowed For Mitigation*	Acres Available For Mitigation	Mitigation Achieved Onsite?	Acres Remaining for Possible Mitigation
Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest	10.60	0	10.6	3:1	0	9.42 (RPO)	1.18	n/a	1.18
Open Engelmann Oak Woodland	18.60	0.39	18.21	3:1	1.17	4.19 (RPO)	14.02	yes	12.85
Dense Engelmann Oak Woodland	13.60	0.93	12.67	3:1	2.79	8.61 (RPO)	4.06	yes	1.27
Southern Riparian Scrub	0.30	0	0.30	3:1	0	0.30 (RPO)	0	n/a	0
Disturbed Wetland (Ag ponds)	0.73	0	0.73	3:1	0	0	0.73	n/a	0.73
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	318.93	69.31	249.62	2:1	138.62	0.52 (RPO) 106.90 (O.S)	142.20	yes	3.58
Southern Mixed Chaparral	229.10	123.27	105.83	0.5:1	61.63	1.16 (RPO) 4.00 (O.S.)	100.67	yes	39.04
Chamise Chaparral	25.20	11.57	13.63	0.5:1	5.78	0	13.63	yes	7.85
Non-native Grassland	50.22	27.61	22.61	1:1**	27.61	1.60 (RPO) 15.08 (O.S)	5.93	no***	-21.68
Eucalyptus Woodland	2.50	0.14	2.36	0:1	0	0	2.36	n/a	2.36
Developed	18.50	13.19	5.31	0:1	0	1.25 O.S.	4.06	n/a	4.06
Mitigated, Impacted Area	246.92	150.63	96.29	0:1	0	0.27 (RPO) 93.27 (O.S.)	2.75	n/a	2.75
Total	**935.20**	**397.04**	**538.16****		**237.60**	**246.57**	**291.59**		**53.99**

*This calculation discounts lands already in open space (O.S.) or is within a County RPO or County RPO buffer

** County guidelines require that non-native grasslands in the Ramona Grasslands area be mitigated at 1:1 (0.5:1 for the non-native grassland and 0.5:1 for raptor foraging)

*** Mitigation for this impact cannot be achieved onsite, in kind; therefore the additional mitigation will be required to be purchased offsite at a pre-approved mitigation bank or other land approved by the director of Planning and Land Use.

****This number differs from the open space subtotals depicted in the Specific Plan for this project since the Specific Plan utilizes different criteria for open space.

The majority of highly sensitive habitats (including oak woodlands and wetlands) are proposed to be avoided as part of the project. The project would also include avoidance measures by placing onsite lands in an open space easement and managing the land in accordance with an approved Resource Management Plan. All potential impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) to the remaining sensitive habitats on the project site will be adequately mitigated according to County regulations to below a level of significance. Proposed mitigation for this project provides an equal or greater benefit to the affected habitats in accordance with the RPO.

3.7 Significant Prehistoric and Historic Lands

The RPO defines Significant Prehistoric or Historic Sites as: Sites that provide information regarding important scientific research questions about prehistoric or historic activities that have scientific, religious, or other ethnic value of local, regional, State, or Federal importance. Such locations shall include, but not be limited to:

(1) Any prehistoric or historic district, site, interrelated collection of features or artifacts, building, structure, or object either:
(aa) Formally determined eligible or listed in the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the National Register; or
(bb) To which the Historic Resource ("H" Designator) Special Area Regulations have been applies; or
(2) One of a kind locally unique or regionally unique cultural resources which contain a significant volume and range of data and materials; and
(3) Any location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances which is either;
(aa) Protected under Public Law 95-341, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act or Public Resources Code Section 5097.9, such as burial(s), pictographs, petroglyphs, solstice observatory sites, sacred shrines, religious ground figures or,
(bb) Other formally designated and recognized sites which are of ritual ceremonial or sacred value to any prehistoric or historic ethnic group.

Sites eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, the State Landmark Register, or the San Diego County Historical Site Board List or sites protected under Public Law 95-341, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act or Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 are also protected under RPO (Figure 7).

- Fourteen prehistoric archaeological sites (SDI-12,473, SDI-12,474, SDI-12,475, SDI-12,476H (archaeological component), SDI-12,480, SDI-12,481, SDI-12,484H, SDI-12,486, SDI-12,489, SDI-12,494/9901, SDI-12,496, SDI-12,497, SDI-12,498, and SDI-

12,506) were determined significant as they contain data to address important research questions related to regional prehistory and/or history—they are significant according to criteria cited in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 21083.2 of the Statutes and 15064.5 of the Guidelines and under criterion D of the California Register. In addition, because site SDI-12,481 contained human remains, the site is significant under criteria of the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). Based on the complexity of remains present at site SDI-12,473, this site also appears significant under RPO criteria.

- Site P-24,282, the quail guzzler, is an important element of the wildlife management history of California—it is significant according to criteria cited in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 21083.2 of the Statutes and 15064.5 of the Guidelines, appears eligible (as part of a district) for the California Register under Criterion A, and appears significant under RPO criteria.
- The Montecito Ranch historic complex (SDI-12,476H), including historic outbuildings and landscape features, is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a contribution to the cultural heritage of California. As well, its frontier Victorian period architecture embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, and/or method of construction. For these characteristics the ranch house complex is significant according to criteria cited in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 21083.2 of the Statutes and 15064.5 of the Guidelines, appears eligible for the California Register under Criteria A and C, and appears significant under RPO criteria. As well, the Montecito Ranch historic complex is identified in the Ramona Community Plan, Montecito Ranch SPA Development Conditions, as a Historic Preservation Area. As such its preservation and maintenance is required.

RPO Findings of Conformance:

The RPO states that "Development, trenching, grading, clearing and grubbing, or any other activity or use damaging to significant prehistoric or historic site lands shall be prohibited, except for scientific investigations with an approved research design […]". The attached table summarizes the potential direct and indirect impacts to RPO significant cultural resources. In summary, the proposed Montecito Ranch Project provides for the preservation of 14 of the 15 significant cultural resources on the property, including the four sites identified as important according to the RPO and the Montecito Ranch complex mandated for preservation by RPO and the Community Plan. An archaeological resources Preservation Plan identifies passive and active protection measures for the fourteen preserved sites and provides a cultural context and research plan to guide impact mitigation data recovery activities to be implemented at the one

prehistoric campsite that will be impacted by development. The archaeological plan also details the archaeological grading monitoring program that will protect known sites from inadvertent impacts during grading and provide for the treatment of unknown buried sites if uncovered during grading.

No RPO significant archaeological resources occur within the proposed offsite road widening footprint.

4.0 Conclusion

The purpose of the County of San Diego RPO is to protect and preserve features, resources, and habitats unique to San Diego County. These features include Steep Slopes, Sensitive Lands, Wetlands, Wetland Buffer Areas, Floodways, and Prehistoric and Historic Sites. As evidenced by this report, the proposed development of the Montecito Ranch project is in conformance with the purpose and guidelines set forth in the RPO for the following resources:

- No impacts to RPO-defined sensitive steep slope lands will occur with the development of the Montecito Ranch property.
- All potential impacts to sensitive habitat lands on the project site will be adequately mitigated to provide an equal or greater benefit to the affected species
- No impacts to wetland habitats or wetland buffer areas will occur onsite, and offsite road impacts meet RPO allowed use findings.
- The Montecito Ranch project is not subject to any RPO-defined floodways, and therefore, will not impact a floodway.
- All RPO significant prehistoric and historic sites will be avoided and/or protected with the implementation of the Montecito Ranch development plan.

5.0 References

The Board of Supervisor of the County of San Diego, The Resource Protection Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9842 (New Series) Effective March 21, 2007.

Heritage Resources, Archaeological Resources Review, Impact Assessment, and Preservation Plan for the Montecito Ranch. January 2008.

REC Consultants, Inc., Biological Technical Report for the Montecito Ranch Property, January 2008.

Stevens Cresto Engineering, Inc., Slope Analysis Maps, August and September 2007.