



COUNTY OF ORANGE

RESOURCES & DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Bryan Speegle, Director
300 N. Flower Street
Santa Ana, CA

P.O. Box 4048
Santa Ana, CA 92702-4048
Telephone: (714) 834-2300
Fax: (714) 834-5188

June 23, 2004

To: Distribution

Re: Errata Sheet / Supplemental CD / Comment Period Extension
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report No. 589

On June 10, 2004, the County of Orange released Draft Program Environmental Impact Report No. 589 ("The Ranch Plan Program DEIR") for public review and comment. Subsequent to the release of the document, the County identified certain minor errors contained in the Ranch Plan Program DEIR. The County has prepared an errata sheet for the Ranch Plan Program DEIR that identifies and corrects these errors. In addition, the County has prepared a supplemental CD that contains three sub-appendices to Appendix G-8 of the Ranch Plan Program DEIR that were inadvertently omitted when the document was released on June 10, 2004. In an effort to promote efficiency and accuracy in the public review process, a copy of the errata sheet and supplemental CD are enclosed for your review.

NOTE:

The public comment period for the Ranch Plan Program DEIR has been extended to August 9, 2004.

Should you have any questions, please contact us at (714) 834-2522.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chuck Shoemaker", is written over a horizontal line.

Chuck Shoemaker, Chief
Environmental Planning Section
Planning and Development Services

Attachment A

ATTACHMENT A THE RANCH PLAN DRAFT PROGRAM EIR ERRATA

The following errors have been noted in The Ranch Plan Draft Program EIR. They do not alter the conclusions of the draft Program EIR or result in any new significant environmental impacts.

VOLUME I

GENERAL NOTES

References to open space not in Development Sensitive Areas (DSA) should be 10,950 acres. References to DSA open space should be 4,171 acres.

SECTION 1, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Page 1-7, second bullet point, has been revised as follows:

- The project site supports eight important habitat for seven endangered and/or threatened species, provides habitat for a rare migrant species, and portions of the site has have been designated as critical habitat for these resources...

Table 1.7-1, Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Program. The following summary information regarding cumulative impacts is provided for each topical issue.

Section 4.1, Land Use and Related Planning Programs: No significant cumulative land use impacts were identified.

Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources: The proposed Ranch Plan project, as well the following projects in the cumulative study area—Alton Parkway, SOCTIIP, Ladera Ranch, Great Park, Northern Sphere, Spectrum 8, and Robinson Ranch—would contribute to the regional loss of Important Farmland. This loss is considered a significant unavoidable impact.

Section 4.3, Population and Housing: The project would not contribute to significant cumulative population, employment, or housing impacts.

Section 4.4: Geology and Soils: No significant cumulative geotechnical and soils impacts were identified.

Section 4.5: Water Resources: With the implementation of flow control programs (i.e., control of peak flows and runoff volumes), cumulative hydrology impacts to watersheds would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Cumulative increases in pathogen levels (i.e., bacteria counts) associated with cumulative development could significantly impact receiving creeks or the ocean. Cumulative development could increase the temperature of runoff and dry-weather flows in downstream waters, as well as increase trace metal loads. All projects within the watersheds are expected to be required to implement treatment and mitigation programs that would reduce pollutants of concern (except pathogens) to less than significant levels in downstream discharge.

Section 4.6: Transportation and Circulation: Under the Year 2025 + Project Buildout analysis, all intersections with the exception of three (Marguerite Parkway at Crown Valley Parkway, Camino Capistrano at Del Obispo Street, and I-5 southbound ramp at Avenida Pico) would operate at acceptable levels of service. Where improvements are located outside the County's jurisdiction, the County will endeavor to enter into agreements with the affected jurisdiction regarding the construction and funding of improvements. However, if such agreements cannot be met, for purpose of the Program

EIR, the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. The project's contribution to impacts on freeway mainline segments that are forecast to operate deficiently is a significant unavoidable impact.

Section 4.7: Air Quality: Short-term construction-related emissions of No_x, CO, VOC, and PM₁₀ would be significant and unavoidable. Long-term operational emissions of CO, VOC, No_x, and PM₁₀ would be significant and unavoidable.

Section 4.8: Noise: Cumulative noise impacts would require the construction of a sound wall on private residential property on Camino Capistrano north of Junipero Serra. Because implementation of this mitigation may not be feasible, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. All other cumulative impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Section 4.9: Biological Resources: The project, with current and probable future projects, would result in the following cumulative impacts: 1) reduced connectivity between proposed habitat blocks; 2) more pronounced internal fragmentation of habitat blocks; 3) greater impacts to key locations of planning species; and 4) reduced ability to fully implement the recommendations of the Adaptive Management Plan regarding restoration of coastal sage scrub/valley grassland. Significant, unavoidable impacts could occur.

Section 4.10: Aesthetics and Visual Resources: There would be a cumulative impact associated with the change in character of the study area and its surroundings. The project would contribute to a cumulative significant impact associated with changes to the visual character of the area, landform alterations, and creation of light or glare.

Section 4.11: Cultural and Paleontological Resources: No cumulative cultural or paleontological impacts were identified.

Section 4.12: Recreation: Cumulative impacts related to increased demand for recreational facilities can be mitigated to a less than significant level. The project would not contribute to or accelerate the substantial physical deterioration of San Onofre State Beach, the Donna O'Neill Land Conservancy, or proposed San Juan Creek Regional Park.

Section 4.13: Mineral Resources: The project would significantly contribute to cumulative impacts on mineral resources in the region. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Section 4.14: Hazards and Hazardous Materials: No cumulative hazardous materials impacts were identified.

Section 4.15: Public Services and Facilities: No cumulative impacts associated with public services or facilities were identified.

SECTION 3, PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Page 3-7, Table 3.4-1, Ranch Plan General Plan Summary, footnote d. has been revised as follows:

- d. Water quality features may be located in either development use areas or open-space areas ~~DSA open space areas~~.

Page 3-20, paragraph one has been revised as follows:

Open Space

For those non-development, non-DSA Overlay areas planned for open space, Section III.I of the Ranch Plan Planned Community Program Text identifies permitted uses, prohibited uses, and design standards. The regulations provide for the protection of valuable environmental resources, while concurrently allowing the implementation/management of certain uses. The authorized uses are limited to those that are of a natural, recreational, educational, or agricultural nature character, as well as with the exception of necessary urban infrastructure (including, but not limited to, designated arterial highways, transportation corridors, utilities, and flood control structures). Additionally, all uses within the open space planning areas must (i) comply with the species and habitat avoidance mitigation measures specified and required by this Program EIR and (ii) comply with the relevant guidelines and requirements set forth in any applicable NCCP/HCP and/or SAMP/MSAA (if adopted).

SECTION 4.1, LAND USE AND RELATED PLANNING PROGRAMS

Page 4.1-9, the last sentence of the last paragraph has been revised as follows:

~~There is not the OSR designation within the Ranch Plan boundary.~~ Pursuant to the County of Orange's General Plan update process conducted by the County, the GERA mitigation site located within the Ranch Plan boundaries was redesignated OSR.

SECTION 4.9, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 4.9-9, the last sentence of the last paragraph has been revised as follows:

The reader is directed to the Baseline Geomorphic and Hydrologic Conditions report for the detailed descriptions of these studies (PCR/BALANCE/PWA 2002) (Appendix G-4 ~~G-8~~).

Page 4.9-26, the sixth paragraph, first sentence has been revised as follows:

Sensitive species detected or with potential to occur in the study area are provided in ~~Tables 4.9-3 and 4.9-4~~.

Page 4.9-28, the third paragraph, first sentence has been revised as follows:

All Group 2 and 3 species have been included in the sensitive wildlife and plant tables ~~(Tables 4.9-3 and 4.9-4)~~.

Page 4.9-28, the fourth paragraph, last sentence has been revised as follows:

~~These "Planning Species" are noted and discussed in Table 4.9-3 and Table 4.9-4.~~

Page 4.9-117, the first paragraph, last sentence has been revised as follows:

For the portions of the circulation systems located *within* the planning areas, these impacts are within the developed footprint and the potential impacts are analyzed for consistency in Appendices G-2 and G-3 ~~G-5 and G-6~~ as part of the Proposed Project consistency analysis.

Page 4.9-253, the second paragraph has been revised as follows:

The following species have ~~has~~ a critical habitat designations that are ~~is~~ in effect over portions of RMV lands. These ~~This~~ in-effect designation are ~~is~~ illustrated on Exhibit 4.9-23:

- California gnatcatcher
- ~~San Diego fairy shrimp~~

SECTION 4.10, AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Pages 4.10-7 and 4.10-8, starting at the bottom of page 4.10-7 and continuing to the next page as been revised as follows:

Effect: A portion of the proposed residential development area located on ~~in~~ the ridgeline ~~valley~~ directly south of the viewpoint and Tesoro High School would be visible from this vantage point. The exhibit conceptually depicts the type of large-lot, low-density ~~multi-family~~ residential development that would be permitted in Planning Area 2....

View 6: Tesoro High School, Southeast Corner...

Effect: Proposed Planning Area 2 low-density ~~multi-family~~ residential and golf course development would be implemented directly south of the viewpoint and would be visible from this vantage point, including a portion of Planning Area 2's ~~low-density~~ development to be located on the ridgeline...Chiquita Canyon Road would not be visible from this vantage point because it would be obscured by large-lot, low-density ~~multi-family~~ residential development in the foreground. Although implementation of development would result in a land use change from open space to residential and golf course development, its proximity to existing urban land uses and ~~the low-density of~~ development would not result in significant aesthetic impacts that are considered to substantially degrade the visual quality of the area.

SECTION 4.15, PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Page 4.15-1, the fourth paragraph, second sentence has been revised as follow:

Exhibit 4.5-4 ~~3-20~~ depicts the locations of the existing, as well as proposed, fire stations.

Table 4.15-5 on page 4.15-21 was incorrectly titled. The correct title for the table is *SMWD Bonding Capacity*.

SECTION 5, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Data from Table 5.4-2, pages 5-18 and 5-19 were inadvertently omitted from the last column (Alternative B-4 Reduced). From the top to bottom of this column, the data for Alternative B-4 Reduced is as follows:

Biological Resources

Substantial adverse effect on
Federal or State agency listed
threatened or endangered species
from habitat modification.

Less

Substantial adverse effect on species Identified as candidates for listing, sensitive, rare, or special status plant or animal species in local/regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS	Less
Substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or sensitive natural community	Less
Substantial adverse effect on State or Federal-protected wetlands	Less
Interfere substantially with native resident movement or migratory or wildlife movement, or wildlife corridors	Similar
Conflict with San Juan Creek Watershed/ Western San Mateo Creek Watershed SAMP/MSAA Planning Principles	Similar for Consistency/ Less for AMP Implementation
Conflict with Southern Subregion NCCP/HCP Guidelines.	Greater for Consistency

Page 5-19, for the Alternative B-9, the text has been revised for the question regarding whether the alternative conflicts with the San Juan Creek Watershed/Western San Mateo Creek Watershed SAMP/MSAA Planning Principles. The revised response is as follows:

Less ~~Greater~~ Consistency/Less for AMP Implementation

Page 5-19, for the Alternative B-11, the text has been revised for the question regarding whether the alternative conflicts with the San Juan Creek Watershed/Western San Mateo Creek Watershed SAMP/MSAA Planning Principles. The revised response is as follows:

Greater ~~Less~~ Consistency

Page 5-25, for the B-11 Alternative, the text has been revised for the question regarding whether the alternative would significantly impact schools. The revised response is as follows:

Same ~~Greater~~/Mitigated

VOLUME II

Exhibit 4.9-9c. The thread-leaved brodiaea major population should have a hatched pattern on the exhibit identifying the major population as a *key location*.

Exhibit 4.12-2, the legend of the exhibit has transposed information. On the legend, the "Dedicated Not Constructed" trails should be represented with a dot pattern. The "Proposed Trail Alignment" should be represented with a dashed pattern.

APPENDIX J

Table 1-4 on page 43. A word processing conversion error resulted in dot marks (•) shown as question marks.

Table 1-6 on page 59. A word processing conversion error resulted in dot marks (•) shown as question marks.

Figure 2. The following data was inadvertently omitted from the bottom box in the figure. The data is: Evaluation and Feedback.

Figure 8. The data is inadvertently omitted from the figure. A revised figure follows this errata.

Figure 9. The following data was inadvertently omitted from the data in the first box on the left in the figure. The data is: Human Collection/Harassment.

Figure 8. COASTAL SAGE SCRUB FOCAL SPECIES STRESSOR MODEL

