MARIPOSA COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 87-431

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE
SOUTH SHORE CLUB PROJECT AT LAKE DON PEDRO, LA VENTANA LAND AND CATTLE
COMPANY, APPLICANT

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, A POLITICAL
SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, Mariposa County has received a request for an amendment to
the Land Use Element of the General Plan in conjunction with a Specific Plan
and Planned Development Zone; and

WHEREAS, the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors, has determined
that an Environmental Impact Report is necessary to analyze the potential
environmental effects of the project; and

WHEREAS, a draft Environmental Impact Report was prepared in
accordance with Section 21000 of the Public Resources Code, otherwise known as
the California Environmental Quality Act, (C.E.Q.A.), and the adopted Mariposa
County Environmental Review Policies and Procedures; and

WHEREAS, public review on the draft Environmental Impact Report was
conducted in accordance with C.E.Q.A. and County Environmental Review Policies
and Procedures; and

WHEREAS, responses to the significant environmental points raised
during the public review period have been responded to by the Lead Agency in
accordance with C.E.Q.A.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Board determines that the
Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Amendment No. 86-2 and
Planned Development Zone/Specific Plan 86-2 is certified in compliance with
Section 21080 et. seq. of the Public Resources Code otherwise known as the
"California Environmental Quality Act" (C.E.Q.A.) in accordance with the
following:
The Final Environmental Impact Report shall consist of the following:

1. The Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared by the environmental consultants Jones and Stokes.

2. A copy of all written comments received in regard to the draft EIR received during the public hearing held on the Draft EIR and the Board of Supervisors responses to all such comments as contained in "Attachment A" of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on the 3rd day of November, 1987 by the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors by the following vote:

AYES: Baggett, Dalton, Radanovich

NOES: Erickson

EXCUSED: Taber

ABSTAINED: None

LEROY RADANOVICH, Chairman
Mariposa County Board of Supervisors

MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGAL SUFFICIENCY:

JEFFREY C. GREEN, County Counsel

10/51-1187
ATTACHMENT A

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SOUTH SHORE CLUB AT
LAKE DON PEDRO

Prepared for:
Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties

Submitted by:
Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.
1725 - 23rd Street
Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816

December 1986
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section I</td>
<td>PURPOSE AND FORMAT OF THE FINAL EIR</td>
<td>I-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II</td>
<td>COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DEIR</td>
<td>II-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO THE DEIR</td>
<td>III-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section I

PURPOSE AND FORMAT OF THE FINAL EIR

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines, the County of Tuolumne as Lead Agency is required, after completion of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies having jurisdiction by law with respect to the proposed project and to provide the applicant and general public with opportunities to comment on the DEIR. The County is also required to respond to significant environmental points raised during the review and consultation period. This Final EIR (FEIR) has been prepared to respond to the public agency and general public comments received on the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro DEIR, which was circulated for review in October 1986. Agency comments include comments from the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors, since the project lies in both Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties.

This document has been prepared in the form of an attachment or addendum to the DEIR as allowed by Section 15146(b) of the CEQA Guidelines. This document and the DEIR, herein incorporated by reference, constitutes the FEIR. The following sections of this document include:

- comments and Tuolumne County responses, by person/group submitting comment, and
- amendments to the DEIR, by page.

Within the written comments, each particular comment is assigned a number in the right margin. Following each letter or set of comments is a set of responses keyed to the assigned comment numbers.

Some responses entail amendment of the DEIR. These amendments appear within the responses in Section II but are also listed sequentially by DEIR page in Section III.
Section II

COMMENTS ON THE DEIR AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The following persons and/or groups commented on the DEIR. Their comments, and the responses to them, follow sequentially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Ventana Land and Cattle Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Hernandez</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bette Ann Erickson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazie Woolstenhulme</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Roberts, Assistant Director, Tuolumne County Department of Transportation and Engineering Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Barrie, IGR Coordinator, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tremewan, Tuolumne County Health Department</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McGee, Fire Protection Planning, Office of the Tuolumne County Fire Warden</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Newman, District Ranger, California Department of Forestry</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Rust, Director, Don Pedro Recreation Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ivers, Director, California Department of Boating and Waterways</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Bennett, President, Tuolumne County Historical Society</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Snyder, President, Lake Don Pedro Homeowners Association</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Smith, Plant Smith Nursery</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anderson, Planner II, Tuolumne County</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gookin, citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Erickson, citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Dalton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Radanovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Taber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Erickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Barrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of Telephone Conversation:

Caller: La Ventana Land and Cattle Company
       Don Beck
       Gary Wood

Date: December 1, 1986

Message: Please incorporate the following minor changes into the project and address the impacts of these changes as necessary in the FEIR:

A. Addition of a 30-acre parcel along the northern boundary of the project area, giving more complete frontage on Bonds Flat Road and

B. A redistribution by county of the proposed residential lots, whereby Tuolumne County's share would increase and Mariposa County's share would equally decrease as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Type</th>
<th>DEIR Assumptions</th>
<th>Proposed 12/86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuol. County</td>
<td>Mariposa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf and lake view</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small estate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 1-1

Addition of 30-acre parcel along Bonds Flat Road. This property, shown on the attached amended Figure 3-2 of the DEIR, is by nature a part of the project site. Its inclusion eliminates the stranding of land in another ownership, and results in the establishment of a more logical project boundary continuously along Bonds Flat Road. This will tend to reduce, rather than increase, the environmental effects of the proposed project. In the case of South Shore Club, the change in all of the formerly proposed project impacts as described in the DEIR are less than significant. Some explanation is warranted, however:

Land Use. The 30-acre addition would be used for extension of the golf course, adjacent small-estate housing, and roadside open space corridor along Bonds Flat Road, but the total amount of housing in the project would not change.

The Tuolumne County General Plan Land Use Designation for the addition is Parks and Recreation, R/P, which may not require amendment to allow the proposed uses.

Population, Employment, Housing. No effect.

Fiscal Impact. Minor. Taxable land value in Tuolumne County would increase slightly (1-2 percent) from that projected in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Public Services. No effect except on law enforcement. Simplified ownership would tend to facilitate law enforcement.

Geology and Soils. Minor effect.

Vegetation and Wildlife. Minor effect.

Water Quality. Minor effect. As with most of the project site, this addition is not within the watershed of the Don Pedro Reservoir. See also Response 10-2.

Traffic, Air Quality, and Noise. No effect.

Aesthetics. Minor effect, except that additional housing may be visible to users of Bonds Flat Road.

Cultural Resources. The addition has not been surveyed for cultural resources. As with the easternmost 38 acres of the project site, this parcel should be surveyed by a qualified archeologist prior to submission of any development plans for the area. Once cultural resources are known, mitigation design proposals should be submitted by the developer.
Response 1-2

In relation to the DEIR, the transfer of 48 lots from Mariposa to Tuolumne County affects fiscal impacts on the local government agencies. One important fiscal impact is related to the responsibility for providing education of project area students. Please refer to Response 3-2 for a discussion of revised student generation estimates for each county and for a discussion of the effects of new legislation affecting school impact fees. The following is a discussion of the overall changes in fiscal impacts to the local agencies as a result of lot redistribution.

The reallocation of single-family residential lots between Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties changes the project-related costs and revenues for the two counties and the Sonora Unified School District (SUSD) and the Mariposa Unified School District (MUSD). The reallocation increases the number of residential lots in Tuolumne County by 48 and reduces the lots in Mariposa County by a like number. The primary effect of this reallocation is to change the property tax revenues projected to be received by each jurisdiction and the costs of providing general county and educational services. The change in residential lots and associated population levels would probably not change the costs of providing police and fire protection.

The following summaries of fiscal impacts for each jurisdiction amend those on pages 7-28 and 7-29 of the DEIR.

Page 7-28, paragraphs 3-5 are amended:

Tuolumne County. Tuolumne County would receive projected project-related annual property tax revenues ranging from $278,670 to $400,360 at project buildout. Tuolumne County would also receive projected annual sales tax revenues of $9,690.

Annual law enforcement costs to the county are estimated to be $75,000. An order-of-magnitude projection of administrative and other general county costs indicates annual project-related costs of $213,640.

The cost-revenue projections indicate total annual costs of $288,640 and total annual revenues ranging from $288,360 to $410,050. Assuming that average revenues approximate the midpoint of this range, the cost-revenue balance would be $288,640 (cost) to $349,200 (revenue). This analysis indicates that there would be no adverse impact on Tuolumne County's fiscal structure. Actual taxable property values at, or near, the low end of the range of assumed values would have a neutral fiscal effect; whereas, actual values above the low range of assumed values would have a beneficial fiscal effect.
Mariposa County. Mariposa County would receive projected project-related annual property tax revenues ranging from $117,020 to $165,680 at project buildout. Mariposa County would also receive projected annual sales tax revenues of $1,940.

No additional law enforcement costs to the County are projected. An order-of-magnitude projection of administrative and other general county costs indicates annual project-related costs of $139,260.

The cost-revenue projections indicate annual total costs of $139,260 and total annual revenues ranging from $118,960 to $167,620. Assuming that average revenues approximate the midpoint of this range, the cost-revenue balance would be $139,260 (cost) to $143,290 (revenue). This analysis indicates that there could be an adverse impact on Mariposa County's fiscal structure if actual taxable property values are at, or near, the low end of the range of assumed values; however, the probable impact of the proposed project on Mariposa County's fiscal structure would be neutral.

SUSD. SUSD would receive additional projected annual property tax revenues ranging from $158,300 to $227,440 at project buildout. Based on 29 new students entering the District, the additional property tax revenues would provide from $5,459 to $7,843 per student. The District would also receive State Aid Apportionment (SAA) funds. Based on SUSD's current SAA allocation, SUSD would receive $2,757 per each additional student.

The total additional revenues would provide from $8,216 to $10,600 per student, which would more than offset the estimated cost to the District of $4,380 per student. The cost-revenue balance indicates that the impact of the project on SUSD's operating budget would be beneficial.

MUSD. MUSD would receive additional projected annual property tax revenues ranging from $213,920 to $302,870 at project buildout. Based on 113 new students entering the District, the additional property tax revenues would provide from $1,890 to $2,680 per student. The District would also receive SAA funds. Based on MUSD's current SAA allocation, MUSD would receive $2,402 per each additional student.

The total additional revenues would provide from $4,292 to $5,082 per student, which would more than offset the estimated cost to the District of $3,830 per student.
The cost-revenue balance indicates that the impact of the project on MUSD's operating budget would be beneficial.

The DEIR discussion of fiscal impacts on Lake Don Pedro Community Services District (LDPCSD) remains unchanged.

The above changes in fiscal impact conclusions should be reflected in amendment of the DEIR Summary Table as follows:

Page 2-3, "Fiscal" impact category is amended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Tuolumne County</th>
<th>None required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected revenue/cost relationship for the county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>depends on eventual project property values within the range analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High range values: net benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid range values: net benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low range values: net balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mariposa County</th>
<th>Expected revenue/cost relationship for the county</th>
<th>None required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>depends on eventual project property values within the range analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High range values: net benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid range values: net balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low range values: net loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of fiscal impact on the school districts and LDPCSD remains unchanged.
To: Planning Department  
County of Tuolumne  
2 South Green Street  
Sonora, CA. 95370

From: Mr. & Mrs. Ralph M. Hernandez

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro

As an extension of the comments presented at the Tuolumne County Planning Department meeting of November 20, 1986, the following suggestions are offered:

To alleviate the backup of cars on Bonds Flat Road at the entrance to the South Shore Club, insure that construction provides for the entry station to be located well within the project area so that vehicles awaiting passage will not extend into Bonds Flat Road (beyond left turn lanes that are to be constructed). At the present time, usually on Friday evenings and always on Fridays preceding holiday weekends, traffic on Bonds Flat Road is lined up and at a standstill for a considerable distance in both directions at the Fleming Meadows entrance. It is pointed out that most of the vehicles entering are very long such as campers, RVs, cars with camping trailers, cars with boats and trailers, etc. and it would also be beneficial if the gate at the Fleming Meadows area was moved further in from the roadway. Statistics on this traffic pattern are probably available at the Don Pedro Recreation Agency.

As an additional suggestion, construction of another road extending from Route 132 to the South end of the project would expedite travel time by dividing the traffic to and from the project; e.g., those vehicles going to Sonora could use Bonds Flat Road while those going to Merced and Modesto could use Route 132.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph M. Hernandez

RALPH M. HERNANDEZ

COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
10/1 1986

II-8
Response 2-1

The proposed mitigation is hereby added to the DEIR as follows:

Page 12-16, 3rd paragraph, add:
To alleviate the backup of cars on Bonds Flat Road near the project entrance, require that the project entry road and station be designed to allow for complete queuing of automobiles within the project site during peak arrival periods.

Response 2-2

While an additional project road connection to Highway 132 would increase convenience, it would not serve to substantially mitigate the identified significant traffic congestion or hazard impacts of the proposed project.
November 28, 1986

Mariposa County Planning Commission

Dear Members:

I am writing in regard to the proposed South Shore Club Project at Don Pedro Lake. I am concerned about the increased financial and safety responsibilities this proposed project would place on our county and its residents.

My areas of concern are as follows:

New roads that will need to be maintained when our county cannot now adequately maintain existing roads. 3-1

The requirement of additional educational classroom space, teachers, busing, and personnel when our county's school budget cannot now provide completely for these already existing needs. 3-2

An increased safety hazard of county residents traveling on Highway 132 between La Grange and Bonds Flat Road - a dangerous portion of highway with many blind hills and curves marked only with a single dotted line. It has been our family's, our employees, and our neighbors' experience to be passed by other vehicles on these blind curves and hills or to be run completely off the road. There have been many fatal and critical accidents on this portion of highway. 3-3

Please consider in studying the impact of this proposed project that whatever revenues it generates for our county they are adequate for the construction and maintenance of the county services this project will require. If they are not is there any means by which the developers and owners can offset the expense to our county? 3-4

Respectfully submitted,

Bette Ann Erickson

P.O. Box 67 Hayward Road
La Grange, Calif. 95329
Response 3-1

All project roads would be private roads maintained by the South Shore Club.

Response 3-2

Due to the recent passage of California Assembly Bill 2926 (Stirling), the financing of school facilities as discussed in the DEIR will be markedly changed after January 1, 1987. The following amendments to the DEIR describe the new system.

Page 8-19, amend paragraphs 4, 5, and 9:

Although the District currently assesses school impact fees to developers to finance interim facilities, new state laws will void this system on January 1, 1987.

The new law will allow the District to assess fees for both the construction of new facilities and the provision of interim facilities. However, the total fee (for either or both purposes) cannot exceed $1.50 per square foot of covered or enclosed residential space and $0.25 per square foot of commercial or industrial floor space. In the case of nonresidential uses, the fee can only be levied if the District formally finds the amount of the fee to be reasonably related to the need for schools caused by the development. (It is presumed that residential uses do create a need for the specified fee.) These fee limits are to be annually adjusted for inflation. The law prohibits the county from issuing building permits until compliance with the District's fee requirement is certified by the District.

Fee monies may be used to provide interim facilities, but only in amount not exceeding the total cost of five annual lease payments for the needed interim facilities.

New facilities are to be financed through a state and local partnership. A school district's share will be the maximum fee amounts described above that were or could have been collected during a designated period of time related to the new facility project. The District may first deduct the cost of providing interim facilities during this period, however. The state's share will be the remaining cost of the new facility, to be funded from general obligation bonds, tideline oil revenues, and other sources specified in the enabling legislation.

The legislation requires that no developer fees other than those described above can be instituted to offset "significant effects" of new development; moreover,
imposition of the fee provides the mitigation of "significant effects" as required by CEQA.

Page 8-21, amend paragraphs 2, 3, 5, and 6, and page 8-23, amend paragraph 2:

Tuolumne County. Implementation of the proposed project would generate an estimated 53 K-8 and 29 9-12 students. This figure is based on a student generation factor of 0.33 K-8 students per single-family unit and 0.18 9-12 students per single-family unit (Tuolumne County General Plan [Master Environmental Impact Report] MEIR Documentation 1980). This increase would create the need for approximately two additional classrooms for K-8 and a proportionate share of additional support facilities, and one additional classroom for 9-12 students in the portion of the project located in Tuolumne County. The K-8 students would attend schools in Mariposa County and the 9-12 students would attend Sonora High School.

Project-generated impaction fees (after January 1, 1987) from the residential portion could generate up to $729,000 (assuming an average residence floor area of 1,500 sf).

Mariposa County. The proposed project would generate an estimated 39 K-8 students per single-family unit and 21 9-12 students per single-family unit, using the above student generation factors in the portion of the project located in Mariposa County. The K-8 students generated from the entire project (92) would attend Mariposa County schools. The 9-12 students would attend Mariposa High School.

Project-generated impaction fees (after January 1, 1987) could generate up to $533,250.

Page 8-23, delete first two mitigation measures under Mariposa County and add a mitigation measure to both counties:

Implement A.B. 2926 to Assess Fees for Interim and Permanent School Facilities. The Districts should establish the maximum allowable impaction fee schedule as soon as possible. The Districts should also take immediate steps to assure state-District partnership funding of planned new school facilities.

The summary table (Table 2-1) entry for Schools also requires amendment:

Page 2-5, amend:

Impact.

II-12
Tuolumne County. An estimated 82 students and up to $729,000 in impaction fees would be generated.

Mariposa County. An estimated 60 students and up to $533,250 in impaction fees would be generated.

Mitigation Measures. Implement A.B. 2926 to assess fees for interim and permanent school facilities (District responsibility).

Response 3-3

Please note that the high accident rate on Route 132 is discussed in the DEIR on page 12-5. Another area of high accident rate or road hazard should be acknowledged at the crossing of the Tuolumne-Mariposa County line and Route 132 by amendment of the DEIR as follows:

Page 12-8

Figure 12-2 is revised (attached).

Please note also that a mitigation measure for road safety hazards is presented on page 12-16 of the DEIR.

Response 3-4

Please refer to Chapters 7 and 8 of the DEIR.
Mariposa Co. Planning Dept.
P.O. Box 2039
Mariposa, CA 95338

Mr. Larry J. Red. Director
We own property near your proposed development for approx 283 single family lots & 1/2 golf course.
This will cause a very large financial impact on the already strapped County, financially, i.e.
School District
More school buildings
More teachers
Road improvement
The existing roads will be inadequate. They are not safe now, for the traffic on them. Highway 132 between La Grange & Conde Flat is a narrow...
Fig 1.
not too safe road at present.
Mariposa County is no
longer a retirement county.
As an example:
Lake don Pedro School.
I am not a new comer to
the area.

Sincerely

Magie Woolstenhulme
(Mrs Wells Woolstenhulme)
PO Box 38
Snelling, Ca. 95369

Nov 19, 1986
Response 4-1

Please refer to Chapter 8 of the DEIR, page 8-18 Schools, and to Response 3-2.

Response 4-2

Please refer to Chapter 12 of the DEIR and to Response 3-3.
December 4, 1986
Memo

To: John Anderson
   Planning Department

From: Alan S. Roberts, R.C.E.
       Assistant Director

Re: Phase I La Ventana
    Recreation & Residential Community

We have reviewed the Environmental Impact Report for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1) A more detailed tentative map needs to be submitted prior to further review of the project.

2) Due to the amount of excavation and trenching involved with this project, a comprehensive geotechnical study is needed prior to approval of construction plans.

3) A drainage study and plan shall be submitted for review and approval by both counties.

4) There are several cul-de-sac roads which exceed 600' in length. Correction of this may require some redesign of the project layout.

5) The report states that the developer should pay an appropriate share for road improvements at major intersections and other potential hazardous areas. It is our recommendation that the developer be required to construct one or more of these proposed road improvement projects with their project to mitigate the developments impact. Upon further study of costs and need for the various roadway improvements, the County and developer should develop a common plan to be implemented to mitigate the traffic hazards impacts surrounding the development.

6) The issue of which agency will conduct plan checking and inspection for road improvements and other infrastructure improvements have not been addressed in the impact report.

   It should be noted that our agency's forces may very well be overtaxed in providing the necessary field inspection which will be demanded by construction of a project of this magnitude over 12 miles of road estimated value over 6 million dollars.

ASR:cs

II-18
Response 5-1

A Tentative Subdivision Map has been submitted to the counties and is under consideration at this time.

Response 5-2

A preliminary geotechnical study was prepared by the developer's geotechnical engineers and is included in the DEIR as Appendix G. The author recommended that further geotechnical investigation involve evaluation of cut slopes over 5 feet high; see DEIR, page 9-8.

Response 5-3

A requirement for submittal of a drainage study and plan would represent adoption of the last mitigation measure on page 9-8 of the DEIS. Appropriate contents for such a plan are addressed therein.

Response 5-4

Cul-de-sac lengths are limited by Tuolumne County ordinance to 600 feet, unless a variance is requested in writing and approved by the County's Director of Transportation and Engineering Services (Roberts pers. comm.). A variance can be granted to prevent excessive earthwork, but a requirement for turnaround "bulbs" every 500 feet would probably be imposed (Roberts pers. comm.).

The Conceptual Master Plan (Figure 3-3 of the DEIR) depicts several cul-de-sacs in excess of 500 feet in length. Actual development approval (Tentative Subdivision Map) would therefore necessitate shortening or acquisition of the needed variances. Either approach would entail redesign and would avoid a significant impact on emergency access at this site. Therefore, the discussion on pages 12-10 and 12-11 of the DEIS requires no amendment.

Response 5-5

The suggested approach of combining the developer's appropriate share of the cost of several improvements to fund one improvement project (or more if appropriate) may have merit. However, it is not equitable to exact compensation for the effects of all three development phases at the outset because of the uncertainties involved in long-term projection. The
suggested mitigation could be applied to Phase I improvements, however. Accordingly, the DEIR is amended as follows:

Page 12-16, add:

The developer's appropriate cost of all traffic improvements expected to be needed by buildout of Phase I, based on the relative traffic generation information described in this chapter, can be estimated by the project engineer (subject to county approval). The developer could then be required to finance an immediate road hazard improvement project at that approximate total cost.

Response 5-6

Plan checking and inspection of road improvements and other infrastructure improvements would be performed by the road/engineering departments of both counties. These additional county costs have been estimated and used in the fiscal impact analysis of DEIR Chapter 7. In particular, see the discussion of the per capita General Fund expenditures on page 7-26, paragraphs 4 and 7.
November 17, 1986

Ms. Peggy Osborn
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Osborne:

We have reviewed the Draft EIR for the La Ventana Don Pedro South Shore Club and offer the following comment.

This concern is in reference to the EIR Section on critical intersections, page 12-15, Paragraph 2. When sufficient quantitative information becomes available, the storage capacity of the left turn lane on Route 120 at La Grange Road should be analyzed. Lengthening may be necessary to accommodate additional left turns; especially if traffic signals are installed.

Any questions involving this comment may be directed to Al Johnson at Caltrans, telephone (209) 948-7838.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Received
P.O. Box 2048 (1976 E. Charter Way)
STOCKTON, CA 95201
(209) 948-3687

10-Sta-120,132
Tuolumne County Planning Department
La Ventana, Don Pedro South Shore Club
Draft EIR
SCR #86072102

Attachment


II-21
Response 6-1

The Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Page 12-15, paragraph 2, add sentence:

A lengthened left-turn lane may be required to accommodate traffic turning left on La Grange Road from Route 120-108.
November 26, 1986

MEMO TO: Tuolumne County Planning Department
FROM: Environmental Health - Robert Tremewan, R.S.
RE: Draft EIR - South Shore Groveland - Don Pedro Area

The Solid Waste portion of the report, found on pages 8.24 through 8.27, contains misstatements of fact. These may arise from the length and detail of the phone conversation with the consultant. They are as follows:

Setting

1. Tuolumne County Transfer Stations are not free of charge and never have been. Mariposa County stations, we believe, are free of charge.

2. Our landfill O & M costs are financed by surcharges on tipping fees. The consultant was advised of impending action along this line in the phone discussion.

Impacts

1. As our transfer stations are provided by our landfill contractor and funded by tipping fees, hauling costs between such stations and our landfill would not be defrayed by County General Fund monies. Consideration of the location of a transfer station in the southwest portion of the county is listed as a future decision step in our Co SWMP, and would be influenced by the population that would be served. As the current transfer station on Merced Falls Road is reserved for use of Tuolumne and Mariposa County taxpayers of the Lake Don Pedro Community Services District, very few people living in that portion of Tuolumne County are currently without transfer station service.
Mitigation Measures

1. The report's suggested mitigation is stated to be inequitable, as it would require taxpayers to pay for transfer station maintenance and for waste hauling. As discussed initially and conveyed to the consultant, basic costs of this type are already defrayed by a private system in Tuolumne County without property tax assistance.

Any transfer station constructed in Tuolumne County would be required to meet the same very high operational and maintenance standards being met by our current sites. As our other sites are served by attendants, a non-attended site would be difficult to consider for approval.

RLT:dmp
Response 7-1

The essence of the comment is that Tuolumne County finances its solid waste program through charges to users. Mariposa County, on the other hand, finances solid waste disposal with tax revenues. This difference of approach presents a major difficulty in reaching a bi-county agreement providing solid waste disposal for the proposed project.

The Draft EIR misstates Tuolumne County's financing methods and therefore requires the following changes:

Page 8-24, paragraph 1, sentence 1 is amended:

Tuolumne County. Supported by user fees, solid waste collection for Tuolumne County is provided by the county's contractor through door-to-door collection or user disposal at transfer stations. The contractor is responsible for hauling all of this waste to a landfill. The landfill operations, under county management, are financed by a surcharge on the user fees collected by the contractor.

Page 8-24, paragraph 1, add sentences:

The county has not provided a transfer station in the Don Pedro Reservoir vicinity, and those residents outside of the Lake Don Pedro subdivision are without access to a transfer station.

Page 8-24, paragraph 2, last sentence:

Delete.

Page 8-25, paragraph 5, sentence 3 is amended:

Under current practices, these haul costs would be financed by the county general fund in Mariposa County and by users in Tuolumne County.

Page 8-27, paragraphs 1 and 2 are amended:

Require Project Residents to Finance Waste Disposal Costs. The Tuolumne County financing system is based on this premise. Accordingly, a negotiated agreement between the two counties should result in disposal of solid waste through the Tuolumne County system.

The South Shore Club and a homeowner's association of lot purchasers should be required to contract with a Tuolumne County solid waste contractor for all project solid waste collection. Fees established by Tuolumne County should be established by bid. Alternatively, the South Shore Club and the homeowner's association could
provide their own waste collection and hauling to the Jamestown Landfill, with equipment and equipment housing provided by the developer.
James E. Owen  
Fire Warden  
Robert J. KempVanEe  
Deputy Fire Warden  

COUNTY FIRE WARDEN  
Tuolumne County Fire Department  

November 24, 1986  

James E. Nuzum  
Planning Director  
#2 South Green  
Sonora, CA 95370  

Attn: John Anderson  
RE: SOUTH SHORE CLUB - E.I.R.  
Lake Don Pedro  

Dear John:  

After reviewing the fire protection section of the EIR for the above project I offer the following comments.  

The equipment currently in use in the Don Pedro area is designed primarily for quick responses into residential areas. The proposed project may change the use of this equipment to large commercial structures. This is not the intended use of this equipment.  

A combined pumping capacity of 750 gpm is provided by the equipment currently in use at the Blanchard CDF station and the Lake Don Pedro station. Our department is requiring a minimum fire flow of 1,250 gpm to service the commercial area. In order for our department to make use of the water supplies the equipment will have to be upgraded when this development occurs.  

In addition, we would like to see as many roads as physically and economically feasible linked together, eliminating terminus bulbs.  

If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact my office.  

Respectfully,  

James R. McGee  
Fire Protection Planning  

JRM/ps
Response 8-1

Since the time of preparation of the Draft EIR, the Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD) has determined that the existing Blanchard Station equipment should be upgraded to service the club "commercial" structures proposed for the project. Therefore, the Draft EIR is hereby amended:

Page 8-17, paragraph 1, add:

The TCFD states that current Blanchard Station equipment is designed for quick response to rural residential areas and does not have sufficient pumping capacity to adequately protect large commercial structures (McGee pers. comm.).

Page 8-17, amend last paragraph:

Construction of the proposed project's club buildings may eventually require upgrading of Blanchard Station equipment pumping capacity from the current 750 gpm to at least 1,250 gpm (McGee pers. comm.). Actual requirements would depend upon specific building design. Development in each county must comply with provisions of each county's Fire Safety Development Standards, of which Tuolumne County's is better developed.

Page 8-18, paragraph 2

Delete.

Page 8-18, add mitigation measure:

Require Developer Financing of Upgrading Blanchard Station Pumping Capacity. Once needed pumping capacity for Blanchard Station pumper units is determined, based on actual club buildings design, require the developer to finance the required capital improvement costs.

Since the club development constitutes introduction of a more intensive land use in the area, it is appropriate that the costs of upgrading local fire protection equipment from single-family home fire suppression capability to larger structure fire suppression capability be a part of the project costs.

Response 8-2

The comment stating a preference will be directed to the decision-making bodies. It should be noted that projects involving a blending of golf fairways and housing tend to entail
reliance upon cul-de-sacs. Where turn-arounds are of sufficient diameter, emergency access vehicles can be readily accommodated.
TO:       James E. Muzum
FROM:    Donald S. Newman
RE: South Shore Club at Lake
        Don Pedro

Structural protection provided by ____________________________ (Station)
From __________ to __________.

Wildland protection provided by ____________________________ (Station)
From __________ to __________.

Response time from "FIRST DUE ENGINE COMPANY" is ______ minutes.

FIRE PROTECTION STANDARDS REQUIRED:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

If fire hazard is rated HIGH by the General Plan Maps, could a Fire Hazard Reduction Plan reduce the hazard enough so that the density proposed by the applicant is acceptable?

Yes ________  No ________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

The California Department of Forestry has reviewed this project and finds that the proposed mitigation measures are adequate at this time.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

11/5/86
(Date)

(Signature)
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Response 9-1

No response is needed.
Mr. James E. Nuzum  
Director of Planning  
2 South Green Street  
Sonora, CA 95370

Dear Mr. Nuzum:

The Don Pedro Recreation Agency, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, Turlock Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District (owners of Don Pedro Reservoir), is responding to your October 30, 1986 request for written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro proposed by South Shore Ranches Ltd. Partnership and La Ventana Land and Cattle Company.

At the time of its inception, the New Don Pedro Project FPC 2299 was carefully evaluated for marina needs within a thorough recreation master planning effort. As called for in this plan, the Agency has developed under concessionaire contract two full service marinas. Moccasin Point Marina is located in the eastern reaches of the reservoir at Moccasin Creek and Lake Don Pedro Marina is located on the reservoir's western reaches at Fleming Meadows. The strategic location of the present two marinas along with a demonstrated willingness of the present concessionaires to fulfill all marina user demands completely satisfies management plan objectives of the Don Pedro Recreation Agency. To date, requests for additional new marina facilities on Don Pedro Lake have been denied by the reservoir owners. Authorization in the future for such facilities is not expected.

The new subdivision's most significant impact to Don Pedro Reservoir will come from urban pollution as briefly touched on in Sec. 11 P. 8 & 9 of the DEIR. Noting that the California Dept. of Water Resources has identified urban pollution as the single most significant source of pollution to California inland waters, the DEIR discussion and mitigation measures are grossly inadequate. Detailed monitoring programs before, during, and after construction should be implemented with careful spelling out of specific elements and characteristics to be monitored along with standards to be maintained for each and the specific steps to be taken should a particular measurement exceed stated standards. Extensive evaluation of urban pollution impacts is clearly needed in the South Shore Club DEIR.

Any amendment to the County's General Plan affecting lands adjacent to the New Don Pedro Project FPC 2299, as discussed by the subdivision proponents, should be addressed only after exhaustive evaluation of impacts expected from amendment adoption.

II-32
In closing, the Don Pedro Recreation Agency would like to inform the Tuolumne County Planning Department that it has been repeatedly contacted by lot owners of the Boise Cascade Lake Don Pedro Subdivision regarding the misrepresentation sales personnel implied in selling subdivision lots. Prospective lot buyers thought their purchase included water access privileges to Don Pedro Lake. It would appear the developers of South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro are setting the stage for another round of misrepresentation of water access privileges. Without a marina and located some two miles from public DPRA facilities, subdivision buyers are left waterfrontless except for the public access privileges afforded at Don Pedro Lake available to everyone. The South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro might best be represented by calling itself the Ridgetop Golf & Tennis Club near Don Pedro Lake...etc. Efforts to capitalize on misnomers as a marketing technique leads to considerable misunderstanding by all concerned.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. Please forward copies of all future correspondence, studies and reports regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Carl W. Rust
Director

CWR:cr
Response 10-1

The comment should be included in the EIR as a statement of agency policy:

Page 4-2, add paragraph:

The director of the Lake Don Pedro Recreation Agency addresses the issue of shoreline development as follows:

"At the time of its inception, the New Don Pedro Project FPC 2299 was carefully evaluated for marina needs within a thorough recreation master planning effort. As called for in this plan, the Agency has developed, under concessionaire contract, two full service marinas. Moccasin Point Marina is located in the eastern reaches of the reservoir at Moccasin Creek, and Lake Don Pedro Marina is located on the reservoir's western reaches at Fleming Meadows. The strategic location of the present two marinas, along with a demonstrated willingness of the present concessionaires to fulfill all marina user demands, completely satisfies management plan objectives of the Don Pedro Recreation Agency. To date, requests for additional new marina facilities on Lake Don Pedro have been denied by the reservoir owners. Authorization in the future for such facilities is not expected."

Response 10-2

The Draft EIR provides a reasonable description of urban runoff effects of the completed project; see page 11-8, paragraph 3 and page 11-9, paragraph 2. The suggested monitoring program for runoff from a project of this magnitude, type, and location is unjustified. Moreover, controlling runoff at the source as proposed in mitigation measures on p. 11-9 is a much more direct approach to minimizing "urban" pollution.

Most of the project area is not within the watershed of Don Pedro Reservoir. The Draft EIR does not make this fact clear and is therefore amended as follows:

Page 11-6, paragraph 4, add:

Only the club facilities, excluding the golf course, are within the reservoir's watershed; see Figure 11-2. All of the golfing/housing project would be in the watersheds of creeks, rivers, and irrigation canals of the foothills and Central Valley.
Emorandum

Date: NOV 10 1986
Subject: SCH#86072102: South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro

From: Department of Boating and Waterways

The Department of Boating and Waterways has reviewed subject Draft Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro, a proposed recreational and residential community, in Tuolumne and Mariposa counties. We would like to offer the following comments:

1. If boating regulations are proposed, they must be prepared and submitted to our Department for review at least 30 days before the effective date thereof, in accordance with the requirements as specified in Sections 660 and 662 of the Harbors and Navigation Code (copy enclosed).

2. If the applicant determines waterway markers, e.g., signs or buoys, are necessary to warn or advise boaters, the markers must be placed or installed in accordance with the requirements as specified in Title 14, Article 6, California Administrative Code (copy enclosed).

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

WILLIAM H. IVERS
Director

Enclosures
Response 11-1

The comment regarding requirements for establishing boating regulations and waterway markers will be brought to the attention of the project designers and the Lake Don Pedro Agency.
John Anderson, Planner  
Tuolumne County Planning Dept.  
2 S. Green St.  
Sonora, CA 95370  

Re: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro  

Dear John:  

The Tuolumne County Historical Society concurs with the mitigation recommendations found on pages 16-4 and 16-5 of the above report. It appears that the project site has the potential to contain many more cultural sites than were discovered during archeological reconnaissance for the CEQA requirements. The society would ask that the mitigation measures proposed be made conditions of any permits or approvals given this project.  

The society also concurs with the recommendation on page F-9 that additional research be conducted towards compiling a comprehensive historical narrative about the Bloss ranch and that the sites found be formally recorded, evaluated and photographed.  

Of additional concern, though outside of the project area, is the Chinese canal. This impressive historic canal should be protected from disturbance and the property owner encouraged to list it on the National Register of Historic Places. Also, the same protection and registration should be extended to a prehistoric site containing over 100 mortar cups.  

Page H-3 indicates that, regarding cultural resources, "large lot development would facilitate the location of residences to avoid any identified cultural resource sites". Hopefully, the location of other amenities and the provision for extensive open space areas will help mitigate, and perhaps fully mitigate, any impacts on historic and prehistoric resources that have been or will be found on the project site.  

Sincerely,  

Diane Bennett, President
Response 12-1

The preferences for conditions of approval will be brought to the attention of the decision-making bodies.

With regard to the cultural resources surveyor's recommendation that additional historical research about the Bloss Ranch be conducted, please note that this concern is embodied in the first mitigation measure on page 16-5 of the DEIR. It should be recalled, however, that most of the Bloss Ranch would be unaffected by project development. Accordingly, the "additional research" mitigation measure is stated to be discretionary in the DEIR.
November 25, 1986

Mr. John B. Anderson  
Tuolumne County Planning Dept.  
2 South Green Street  
Sonora, Ca., 95370

RE: Notice of Preparation for a Draft EIR on the La Ventana Recreation and Residential Community in the Lake Don Pedro area.

Mr. John B. Anderson and Planning Department members,

The Lake Don Pedro Owners' Association feels that the project described would be a valuable asset to the area. There are no specific concerns regarding the impact of the project.

We hope that the Planning Department will look favorably on the project as we feel that it would be beneficial not only to our Subdivision but also to the Lake Don Pedro Community Services District.

Respectfully,

Robert G. Snyder, President  
Board of Directors  
Lake Don Pedro Owners' Association

RGS/gt
Response 13-1

No response is needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic buttercup</td>
<td>Ranunculus aquatilis var. hispidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster</td>
<td>Aster chilensis var. medius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black willow</td>
<td>Salix goodingii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodiaea</td>
<td>Brodiaea spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brome grasses</td>
<td>Bromus spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckbrush</td>
<td>Ceanothus cuneatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattails</td>
<td>Typha latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>Trifolium spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote thistle</td>
<td>Eryngium vaseyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curly dock</td>
<td>Rumex crispus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digger pine</td>
<td>Pinus sabiniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fescue grass</td>
<td>Vulpia spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddleneck</td>
<td>Amsinckia spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filaree</td>
<td>Erodium spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtail grass</td>
<td>Hordeum spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior live oak</td>
<td>Quercus wislizenii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky bluegrass</td>
<td>Poa pratensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine</td>
<td>Lupinus spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa lily</td>
<td>Calochortus spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowfoam</td>
<td>Limnanthes montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey flower</td>
<td>Mimulus guttatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owls clover</td>
<td>Orthocarpus spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison oak</td>
<td>Toxicodendron diversilobum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popcorn flower</td>
<td>Plagiobothrys spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppy</td>
<td>Eschscholzia spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitsfoot grass</td>
<td>Polypogon monspeliensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap root</td>
<td>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White brodiae</td>
<td>Brodiaea hyancinthina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild oaks - OATS</td>
<td>Avena spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild mustard</td>
<td>Brassica spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>Salix spp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 14-1

The correction is appreciated. The DEIR is hereby amended as follows:

Page E-6

Change "Wild oaks" to "Wild oats".
Report of Telephone Conversation:

Caller: John Anderson, Planner II, Tuolumne County Planning Department

Date: December 2, 1986

Message: A. Only actual development approvals must be withheld from project lands for which a Williamson Act contract is in a 10-year termination process.

B. Two acreages are given in the DEIR for lands currently taxed at the rate applicable to Williamson Act contract lands--460 acres and 492 acres.
Response 15-1

The County of Tuolumne cannot issue a development permit for lands now under Williamson Act contract within 10 years of a Notice of Non-Renewal. However, the county can amend the General Plan designations for such lands, rezone them, and enter into agreements for their development at any time. Accordingly, the DEIR is amended as follows:

Page 4-3, paragraph 4, last sentence:

Delete.

Response 15-2

The best estimate for the acreage of lands currently assessed as Williamson Act contract lands is 460 acres. See also Response 16-7.
The following is a summary of comments submitted regarding the adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro.

1. Mazie Woolstenhulme - Letter
   A. Concerned about fiscal impact on County, particularly schools.  
   B. States that existing roads are inadequate and will be impacted by the development. Highway 132 between La Grange and Bonds Flat Road is of particular concern.

2. Bette Ann Erickson - Letter
   A. Concerned about costs to County of maintaining roads.  
   B. Concerned about school impacts.  
   C. Increased safety hazard on Highway 132 between La Grange and Bond Flat Road because it is presently a dangerous portion of Highway with blind hills and curves. Many serious accidents have occurred on this section of road.  
   D. Generally concerned about fiscal impact on County.

3. Tom Gookin - Verbal Input
   A. Concerned about the effect of increased traffic on the dangerous portion of Highway 132 near County line.  
   B. Did not think that mitigation measures for impacts on Ag uses associated with roaming dogs was adequate.  
   C. Concerned about increased fire hazard associated with undeveloped (and ungrazed) parcels.  
   D. Concerned about water quality impacts associated with the proposed sewer plant.  
   E. Concerned about fiscal impacts on County associated with maintenance of water and sewage system.  
   F. Concerned about the effect of the project on future agricultural uses of his property.

4. Tim Erickson - Verbal Input
   A. Concerned about effect of increased traffic on dangerous portion of Highway 132.
B. Concerned about fiscal impacts on County if responsible for road maintenance with the development.

C. Concerned about effect on Mariposa County Unified School District, particularly the costs associated with student busing.

D. Generally concerned about water quality as it may be affected by the proposed water and sewage system.

5. Supervisor Dalton - Verbal Input

A. Requested that the existing bi-county fire fighting arrangement be discussed with greater detail in the environmental setting portion of the document.

B. Requested that the E.I.R. evaluate as a mitigation for impacts on police protection the possibility of a cooperative agreement for mutual aid between the County Sheriff Departments.

C. Stated that impact on fire fighting services was complicated by a shortage of manpower as well as equipment.

6. Supervisor Radanovich - Verbal Input

A. Requested that the fiscal impact and public service analysis section be expanded to address the impacts associated with a larger build out period. Information on build out time frames for past development in the area show that the estimates in the EIR may not be accurate.

B. Discussion of impacts on public services should be more detailed and relate to the potential slow build out of the subdivision. Mitigation measures within these sections should be more specific so that they can properly be applied to the project where appropriate. Document should discuss phased mitigation to ensure that the mitigation measures are applied at the appropriate time. These sections should also address the effects of increased population growth resulting indirectly from the project (employee generated).

C. Mitigation measures for fire protection service impacts should be more specific and should relate to the existing bi-county fire fighting system.

7. Supervisor Taber - Verbal Input

A. Requested that figure 5-1 be re-labeled to reflect actual situation. Suggested wording "Project site lands taxed as
8. Supervisor Erickson - Verbal Input

A. Requested that the EIR generally compare the permitted and conditional uses in the existing and proposed General Plan land uses and evaluate the potential for land use conflicts.

B. Generally did not think mitigation measures are adequate due to lack of specificity. Requested that additional analysis be provided regarding the effect of the proposed mitigation measures.

C. Generally concerned about the immediate loss of 2000 acres of agricultural grazing land associated with the project and the potential loss of off-site agricultural lands associated with the growth inducing effect of the project.

D. Requests that the analysis of agricultural productivity in Section 5 include a discussion of carrying capacity in animal unit months.

E. The EIR should address in greater detail the impact of the development on the wildland fire hazard in the area with particular attention given to the impacts associated with the proposed mitigation measure prohibiting grazing in the openspace area.

F. Feels that mitigation measure proposed to address the effect of roaming dogs on ag uses is not adequate.

G. Requested that the EIR address the potential loss of mining lands on and off-site. The present land use classification permits mining use while mining is typically not compatible with the proposed land use.

9. Supervisor Barrick - Verbal Input

A. Felt that page numbering system in document is confusing.

B. Stated that the E.I.R should more clearly identify which mitigation measures could be applied directly to the development and which would require action by the County(s) outside of the permitting process for this development.

C. Stated her opinion that mitigation measures that cannot be directly applied to the project are not appropriate for discussion within the E.I.R.
Response 16-1

See Response 4.

Response 16-2

See Response 3.

Response 16-3

A. See Response 3-3.

B. The impact of roaming dogs on adjacent agricultural operations is not addressed in the DEIR. The impact of roaming dogs on deer and other wildlife is addressed on pages 10-13, 16, and 17. To correct this oversight and strengthen mitigation of these impacts, the DEIR is amended as follows:

Page 10-17, first full sentence is amended:

County lease laws, project site deed restrictions, and club rules prohibiting free-roaming dogs could be enacted, and the club security patrol could be required to assure compliance.

C. Exclusion of cattle from the project open space, as recommended on page 5-19 of the DEIR, could result in a significant increase in herbaceous biomass in areas surrounding the development. This would represent an increased fire hazard. Amendments to the DEIR are needed to address this issue:

Page 8-17, paragraph 4, sentence 3 is amended:

Natural open space areas adjacent to the project development would be particularly susceptible to project-related fire starts if cattle were excluded therefrom and no other biomass management were practiced.

Page 8-18, add mitigation measure:

Require Fire Hazard Reduction Planning and Implementation. The developer, on behalf of the South Shore Club, should prepare a management plan for biomass reduction in the project open space area. This could include grazing of horses from the equestrian center, prescribed fire, and other management. Implementation could be assured through periodic field review by the counties' fire wardens.
D. The issue of water quality impacts associated with the proposed sewer plant is discussed in detail on pages 11-10 through 11-12 of the DEIS.

E. The issue of fiscal impacts on the LDPCSD for maintenance of the proposed water and wastewater systems is discussed on pages 8-2, -4, -5, and -6 and on pages 7-8, -25, -27, -28, and -29 of the DEIR.

F. Agricultural operations on ownerships other than La Ventana Land and Cattle Company would not be expected to be affected by the proposed project. The DEIR should be amended to clarify this expectation:

Page 5-17, last paragraph is amended:

The proximity of project site residential and recreational development to adjacent pasture land of La Ventana Land and Cattle Company could result in significant adverse impacts to their commercial cattle operations. Pasturelands in other ownerships are not expected to be affected. The impacts include: (4 items unchanged).

Response 16-4

A. See Response 3-3.

B. The county would not be responsible for maintenance of the project's private road system.

C. See Response 3-2 for a revised discussion of financing school district impacts and financial assistance through newly legislated impact fees. See Response 1-2 for a revised fiscal analysis for the proposed project; effects on the school districts are included.

Busing costs apparently cannot be met through impaction fees. Thus, a mitigation measure involving cost-sharing between the developer and the Mariposa County School District should be retained in the FEIR as follows:

Page 8-23, add Mariposa County mitigation measure:

Negotiate Funding of Buses. The developer should be required to contribute to busing costs based on the anticipated number of project-generated students described herein and a District evaluation of busing needs.

D. See Response 16-3, D.
Response 16-5

A. The DEIR should be amended as follows:

Page 8-16, paragraph 2, add:

Mariposa County shares in the cost of financing both CDF's nonfire season protection and Tuolumne County's Lake Don Pedro Volunteer Fire Company. For FY 1985-86 the two counties entered into an agreement whereby the counties split equally CDFs added cost of providing the service ($11,700), although Tuolumne County remained responsible for executing the cooperative agreement with CDF. (Mariposa also contributed an administrative charge.) In June 1986, Mariposa County also contributed $2,000 to assist Tuolumne County's funding of the volunteer fire company; no formal agreement or contract accompanied this grant.

B. The DEIR should be amended as follows:

Page 8-15, under "Mitigation Measures" add:

Negotiate an Agreement for Providing Service to the Proposed Project Site. Mariposa and Tuolumne Counties should negotiate provision of non-emergency law enforcement by a single entity for the project site. This would avoid a duplication of effort as is assumed in the following two mitigation measures. A mutual assistance agreement for emergency responses should also be adopted.

C. See Response 8-1.

Response 16-6

A. The relationship of public service fiscal impacts to actual project buildout rates is discussed in some detail in the DEIR; see pages 7-10 through 7-13. The rate of buildout of the Lake Don Pedro Subdivision (LDPS) is described and a comparison to the proposed project is given. Differences between the developments suggest that lots in the project area would be built upon much faster than would lots in the LDPS (page 7-12, paragraph 2).

The discussion in the DEIR concludes that the effect of the actual buildout rate on the project-related cost/revenue balance for the counties as special districts should not be significant (page 7-12, paragraph 4). In general, revenues would precede costs (page 7-13, paragraph 1), thus the ratio of cost and revenues of interim phases of the project should not differ significantly from that at full buildout (paragraph 2).
Thus, the conclusions of the fiscal analysis, as described in the DEIR and modified by Response 1-2 herein, are valid independent of buildout rate.

B. All mitigation measures described in the DEIR would apply in the case of slow buildout of the subdivision. Mitigation measures presented in the DEIR are as specific as possible at this point in the project conceptualization. Where specificity must be deferred, concepts and general approaches are presented. Phasing of these mitigation requirements is also described. The set of mitigation measures can now be translated to conditions of approval for particular development approvals by agency staff. Clearly, a broad public service cooperative agreement between the Tuolumne and Mariposa Boards of Supervisors is an important aspect of that process.

The effects of employee-generated population growth are incorporated into the impact discussions of the DEIR. The amount of employee-generated growth is estimated on page 6-19 of the DEIR. It is described on pages 6-19 and -20. The specific impact of employee-generated housing is assessed on page 6-19.

C. See Response 16-5, A.

Response 16-7

A. Several changes in the DEIR are needed to reflect the fact that lands in Mariposa County, now taxed by Tuolumne County at a rate applicable to Williamson Act Agricultural Preserves, are not actually encompassed by Williamson Act contracts (Anderson pers. comm.).

Page 2-4, Land Use, amend:

Conversion of 460 acres of Williamson Act contract land, situated in Tuolumne County.

Page 4-3, paragraph 3, amend:

Approximately 460 acres of the project site are under agricultural preserve contracts between landowners and the County of Tuolumne, as authorized by the ... Williamson Act . . .

Page 4-5, paragraph 4, first sentence, amend:

All of the Williamson Act contracts are with Tuolumne County.

Page 4-5, paragraph 4, last sentence, amend:

However, these lands do not have contract status.
Page 5-1, last paragraph, first sentence, amend:

Approximately 460 acres of the project site (23 percent) are assessed as agricultural preserves. . . . (Delete second sentence). This represents 0.4 percent of the 126,500 acres of Tuolumne County's Williamson Act lands.

Page 5-2, Figure 5-1 title, amend:

Project site lands taxed as Williamson Act Preserves.

Page 5-17, paragraph 3, amend:

Approximately 460 acres. . . .

Response 16-8

A. Permitted and conditional uses under existing general plan designations are described on pages 5-4, and -5 of the DEIR. Provisions of the proposed General Plan Designations are described on page 5-14. Since development approvals will involve a development agreement in Tuolumne County and a Planned Development zone in Mariposa County, only those uses that are compatible with the project master plan would be allowed in the future.

The potential for land use conflicts is described on pages 5-17 and -18 of the DEIR.

B. Mitigation measures presented in the DEIR are as specific as possible at this point in project conceptualization. Where specificity must be deferred, concepts and general approaches are presented. The set of mitigation measures can now be translated to conditions of approval for particular development entitlements by agency staff.

C. The loss of grazing land is described on pages 5-1 through 5-3 and 5-17 through 5-20 of the DEIR.

Only minor acreages of additional agricultural lands would possibly be converted to commercial uses to support the project population. This growth inducement is described on page 6-21 of the DEIS. A mitigation measure is given on page 6-22.

D. As presented on page 5-1 of the DEIS, 1,135 cow-calf units are grazed for 6 months annually on the entire La Ventana ranch. The project constitutes 25 percent of the ranch area. Thus, approximately 1,700 animal unit months (AUMs) per year would be lost by project implementation.

E. See Response 16-3, C.

F. See Response 16-3, B.
G. Mining would be completely incompatible with the proposed project, as stated. The mineral potential of the site is not well known, however. A review of available data sources suggests some potential for the occurrence of gold but not for other mineral deposits or construction materials. The DEIR is amended as follows.

Page 9-1, add section:

Mineral Potential

Mineral potential of the project site is not well known but appears to be less-than-significant.

Geotechnical maps of Tuolumne County's General Plan do not identify any known high value mineral resource in the area, such as construction-grade aggregate or limestone (Anderson pers. comm.). No significant alluvial deposits have been reported onsite (Appendix G), and the potential of the site as a source for construction grade aggregate must be considered low to nil.

As noted, the site is comprised of metavolcanic and metasedimentary rocks (especially greenstones and slates) that were intruded by siliceous material during and subsequent to metamorphism. This resulted in the formation of some gold-quartz veins within the Bloss Ranch and vicinity, which may include the project site.

An area 3-6 miles east of the project site known as the Granite Springs Gold District, yielded moderate amounts of gold from somewhat similar rock types until the 1930s. Most of the deposits were relatively shallow and were worked out. This occurrence seems to have been associated with the Bear Mountains fault zone giving rise to Piney Ridge and the trough inundated by Lake McClure east of the project site.

No known mine shafts are present on the Bloss Ranch, but some prospect holes were excavated. Interviews with older, long-time residents conducted as a part of the cultural resource assessment for the project (Appendix F) indicate that the gold recovered from these "bull quartz" vein prospect holes was not great.

Response 16-9

A. No response is needed.

B. The identification of the responsible party for each mitigation measure is explicit in Table 2-1 on page 2-3 of the DEIR; see footnote a.
C. The commentator's preference will be brought to the attention of the decision-making bodies.
Section III

AMENDMENTS TO THE DEIR

Page 2-3, "Fiscal" impact category is amended:

Fiscal

Tuolumne County
Expected revenue/cost relationship for the county depends on eventual project property values within the range analyzed.
High range values: net benefit
Mid range values: net benefit
Low range values: net balance

Mariposa County
Expected revenue/cost relationship for the county depends on eventual project property values within the range analyzed.
High range values: net benefit
Mid range values: net balance
Low range values: net loss

Page 2-4, Land Use, amend:

Conversion of 460 acres of Williamson Act contract land, situated in Tuolumne County.

Page 2-5, amend:

Impact.

Tuolumne County. An estimated 82 students and up to $729,000 in impaction fees would be generated.

Mariposa County. An estimated 60 students and up to $533,250 in impaction fees would be generated.

Mitigation Measures. Implement A.B. 2926 to assess fees for interim and permanent school facilities (District responsibility).

Page 4-2, add paragraph:

The director of the Lake Don Pedro Recreation Agency addresses the issue of shoreline development as follows:
"At the time of its inception, the New Don Pedro Project FPC 2299 was carefully evaluated for marina needs within a thorough recreation master planning effort. As called for in this plan, the Agency has developed, under concessionaire contract, two full service marinas. Moccasin Point Marina is located in the eastern reaches of the reservoir at Moccasin Creek, and Lake Don Pedro Marina is located on the reservoir's western reaches at Fleming Meadows. The strategic location of the present two marinas, along with a demonstrated willingness of the present concessionaires to fulfill all marina user demands, completely satisfies management plan objectives of the Don Pedro Recreation Agency. To date, requests for additional new marina facilities on Lake Don Pedro have been denied by the reservoir owners. Authorization in the future for such facilities is not expected."

Page 4-3, paragraph 3, amend:

Approximately 460 acres of the project site are under agricultural preserve contracts between landowners and the County of Tuolumne, as authorized by the . . . Williamson Act. . . .

Page 4-3, paragraph 4, last sentence:

Delete.

Page 4-5, paragraph 4, first sentence, amend:

All of the Williamson Act contracts are with Tuolumne County.

Page 4-5, paragraph 4, last sentence, amend:

However, these lands do not have contract status.

Page 5-1, last paragraph, first sentence, amend:

Approximately 460 acres of the project site (23 percent) are assessed as agricultural preserves. . . . (Delete second sentence). This represents 0.4 percent of the 126,500 acres of Tuolumne County’s Williamson Act lands.

Page 5-2, Figure 5-1 title, amend:

Project site lands taxed as Williamson Act Preserves.
Page 5-17, paragraph 3, amend:

Approximately 460 acres. . . .

Page 5-17, last paragraph is amended:

The proximity of project site residential and recreational development to adjacent pasture land of La Ventana Land and Cattle Company could result in significant adverse impacts to their commercial cattle operations. Pasturelands in other ownerships are not expected to be affected. The impacts include: (4 items unchanged).

Page 7-28, paragraphs 3-5 are amended:

Tuolumne County. Tuolumne County would receive projected project-related annual property tax revenues ranging from $278,670 to $400,360 at project buildout. Tuolumne County would also receive projected annual sales tax revenues of $9,690.

Annual law enforcement costs to the county are estimated to be $75,000. An order-of-magnitude projection of administrative and other general county costs indicates annual project-related costs of $213,640.

The cost-revenue projections indicate total annual costs of $288,640 and total annual revenues ranging from $288,360 to $410,050. Assuming that average revenues approximate the midpoint of this range, the cost-revenue balance would be $288,640 (cost) to $349,200 (revenue). This analysis indicates that there would be no adverse impact on Tuolumne County's fiscal structure. Actual taxable property values at, or near, the low end of the range of assumed values would have a neutral fiscal effect; whereas, actual values above the low range of assumed values would have a beneficial fiscal effect.

Page 7-28, paragraphs 6-8 are amended:

Mariposa County. Mariposa County would receive projected project-related annual property tax revenues ranging from $117,020 to $165,680 at project buildout. Mariposa County would also receive projected annual sales tax revenues of $1,940.

No additional law enforcement costs to the County are projected. An order-of-magnitude projection of administrative and other general county costs indicates annual project-related costs of $139,260.

The cost-revenue projections indicate annual total costs of $139,260 and total annual revenues ranging from $118,960 to $167,620. Assuming that average revenues
approximate the midpoint of this range, the cost-revenue balance would be $139,260 (cost) to $143,290 (revenue). This analysis indicates that there could be an adverse impact on Mariposa County's fiscal structure if actual taxable property values are at, or near, the low end of the range of assumed values; however, the probable impact of the proposed project on Mariposa County's fiscal structure would be neutral.

Page 7-29, paragraphs 1-6 are amended:

SUSD. SUSD would receive additional projected annual property tax revenues ranging from $158,300 to $227,440 at project buildout. Based on 29 new students entering the District, the additional property tax revenues would provide from $5,459 to $7,843 per student. The District would also receive State Aid Apportionment (SAA) funds. Based on SUSD's current SAA allocation, SUSD would receive $2,757 per each additional student.

The total additional revenues would provide from $8,216 to $10,600 per student, which would more than offset the estimated cost to the District of $4,380 per student. The cost-revenue balance indicates that the impact of the project on SUSD's operating budget would be beneficial.

MUSD. MUSD would receive additional projected annual property tax revenues ranging from $213,920 to $302,870 at project buildout. Based on 113 new students entering the District, the additional property tax revenues would provide from $1,890 to $2,680 per student. The District would also receive SAA funds. Based on MUSD's current SAA allocation, MUSD would receive $2,402 per each additional student.

The total additional revenues would provide from $4,292 to $5,082 per student, which would more than offset the estimated cost to the District of $3,830 per student. The cost-revenue balance indicates that the impact of the project on MUSD's operating budget would be beneficial.

Page 8-15, under "Mitigation Measures" add:

Negotiate an Agreement for Providing Service to the Proposed Project Site. Mariposa and Tuolumne Counties should negotiate provision of non-emergency law enforcement by a single entity for the project site. This would avoid a duplication of effort as is assumed in the following two mitigation measures. A mutual assistance agreement for emergency responses should also be adopted.
Page 8-16, paragraph 2, add:

Mariposa County shares in the cost of financing both CDF's nonfire season protection and Tuolumne County's Lake Don Pedro Volunteer Fire Company. For FY 1985-86 the two counties entered into an agreement whereby the counties split equally CDF's added cost of providing the service ($11,700), although Tuolumne County remained responsible for executing the cooperative agreement with CDF. (Mariposa also contributed an administrative charge.) In June 1986, Mariposa County also contributed $2,000 to assist Tuolumne County's funding of the volunteer fire company; no formal agreement or contract accompanied this grant.

Page 8-17, paragraph 1, add:

The TCFD states that current Blanchard Station equipment is designed for quick response to rural residential areas and does not have sufficient pumping capacity to adequately protect large commercial structures (McGee pers. comm.).

Page 8-17, paragraph 4, sentence 3 is amended:

Natural open space areas adjacent to the project development would be particularly susceptible to project-related fire starts if cattle were excluded therefrom and no other biomass management were practiced.

Page 8-17, amend last paragraph:

Construction of the proposed project's club buildings may eventually require upgrading of Blanchard Station equipment pumping capacity from the current 750 gpm to at least 1,250 gpm (McGee pers. comm.). Actual requirements would depend upon specific building design. Development in each county must comply with provisions of each county's Fire Safety Development Standards, of which Tuolumne County's is better developed.

Page 8-18, paragraph 2

Delete.

Page 8-18, add mitigation measure:

Require Developer Financing of Upgrading Blanchard Station Pumping Capacity. Once needed pumping capacity for
Blanchard Station pumper units is determined, based on actual club buildings design, require the developer to finance the required capital improvement costs.

Since the club development constitutes introduction of a more intensive land use in the area, it is appropriate that the costs of upgrading local fire protection equipment from single-family home fire suppression capability to larger structure fire suppression capability be a part of the project costs.

Page 8-18, add mitigation measure:

Require Fire Hazard Reduction Planning and Implementation. The developer, on behalf of the South Shore Club, should prepare a management plan for biomass reduction in the project open space area. This could include grazing of horses from the equestrian center, prescribed fire, and other management. Implementation could be assured through periodic field review by the counties' fire wardens.

Page 8-19, amend paragraphs 4, 5, and 9:

Although the District currently assesses school impact fees to developers to finance interim facilities, new state laws will void this system on January 1, 1987.

The new law will allow the District to assess fees for both the construction of new facilities and the provision of interim facilities. However, the total fee (for either or both purposes) cannot exceed $1.50 per square foot of covered or enclosed residential space and $0.25 per square foot of commercial or industrial floor space. In the case of nonresidential uses, the fee can only be levied if the District formally finds the amount of the fee to be reasonably related to the need for schools caused by the development. (It is presumed that residential uses do create a need for the specified fee.) These fee limits are to be annually adjusted for inflation. The law prohibits the county from issuing building permits until compliance with the District's fee requirement is certified by the District.

Fee monies may be used to provide interim facilities, but only in amount not exceeding the total cost of five annual lease payments for the needed interim facilities.

New facilities are to be financed through a state and local partnership. A school district's share will be the maximum fee amounts described above that were or could have been collected during a designated period of time related to the new facility project. The District may first deduct
the cost of providing interim facilities during this period, however. The state's share will be the remaining cost of the new facility, to be funded from general obligation bonds, tideline oil revenues, and other sources specified in the enabling legislation.

The legislation requires that no developer fees other than those described above can be instituted to offset "significant effects" of new development; moreover, imposition of the fee provides the mitigation of "significant effects" as required by CEQA.

Page 8-21, amend paragraphs 2, 3, 5, and 6, and page 8-23, amend paragraph 2:

Tuolumne County. Implementation of the proposed project would generate an estimated 53 K-8 and 29 9-12 students. This figure is based on a student generation factor of 0.33 K-8 students per single-family unit and 0.18 9-12 students per single-family unit (Tuolumne County General Plan [Master Environmental Impact Report] MEIR Documentation 1980). This increase would create the need for approximately two additional classrooms for K-8 and a proportionate share of additional support facilities, and one additional classroom for 9-12 students in the portion of the project located in Tuolumne County. The K-8 students would attend schools in Mariposa County and the 9-12 students would attend Sonora High School.

Project-generated impaction fees (after January 1, 1987) from the residential portion could generate up to $729,000 (assuming an average residence floor area of 1,500 sf).

Mariposa County. The proposed project would generate an estimated 39 K-8 students per single-family unit and 21 9-12 students per single-family unit, using the above student generation factors in the portion of the project located in Mariposa County. The K-8 students generated from the entire project (92) would attend Mariposa County schools. The 9-12 students would attend Mariposa High School.

Project-generated impaction fees (after January 1, 1987) could generate up to $533,250.

Page 8-23, add Mariposa County mitigation measure:

Negotiate Funding of Buses. The developer should be required to contribute to busing costs based on the anticipated number of project-generated students described herein and a District evaluation of busing needs.
Page 8-23, delete first two mitigation measures under Mariposa County and add a mitigation measure to both counties:

Implement A.B. 2926 to Assess Fees for Interim and Permanent School Facilities. The Districts should establish the maximum allowable impaction fee schedule as soon as possible. The Districts should also take immediate steps to assure state-District partnership funding of planned new school facilities.

Page 8-24, paragraph 1, sentence 1 is amended:

Tuolumne County. Supported by user fees, solid waste collection for Tuolumne County is provided by the county's contractor through door-to-door collection or user disposal at transfer stations. The contractor is responsible for hauling all of this waste to a landfill. The landfill operations, under county management, are financed by a surcharge on the user fees collected by the contractor.

Page 8-24, paragraph 1, add sentences:

The county has not provided a transfer station in the Don Pedro Reservoir vicinity, and those residents outside of the Lake Don Pedro subdivision are without access to a transfer station.

Page 8-24, paragraph 2, last sentence:

Delete.

Page 8-25, paragraph 5, sentence 3 is amended:

Under current practices, these haul costs would be financed by the county general fund in Mariposa County and by users in Tuolumne County.

Page 8-27, paragraphs 1 and 2 are amended:

Require Project Residents to Finance Waste Disposal Costs. The Tuolumne County financing system is based on this premise. Accordingly, a negotiated agreement between the two counties should result in disposal of solid waste through the Tuolumne County system.

The South Shore Club and a homeowner's association of lot purchasers should be required to contract with a Tuolumne County solid waste contractor for all project solid waste collection. Fees established by Tuolumne County should be established by bid. Alternatively, the South Shore Club and the homeowner's association could provide their own waste collection and hauling to the Jamestown Landfill, with equipment and equipment housing provided by the developer.
Page 9-1, add section:

**Mineral Potential**

Mineral potential of the project site is not well known but appears to be less-than-significant.

Geotechnical maps of Tuolumne County's General Plan do not identify any known high value mineral resource in the area, such as construction-grade aggregate or limestone (Anderson pers. comm.). No significant alluvial deposits have been reported onsite (Appendix G), and the potential of the site as a source for construction grade aggregate must be considered low to nil.

As noted, the site is comprised of metavolcanic and metasedimentary rocks (especially greenstones and slates) that were intruded by siliceous material during and subsequent to metamorphism. This resulted in the formation of some gold-quartz veins within the Bloss Ranch and vicinity, which may include the project site.

An area 3-6 miles east of the project site known as the Granite Springs Gold District, yielded moderate amounts of gold from somewhat similar rock types until the 1930s. Most of the deposits were relatively shallow and were worked out. This occurrence seems to have been associated with the Bear Mountains fault zone giving rise to Piney Ridge and the trough inundated by Lake McClure east of the project site.

No known mine shafts are present on the Bloss Ranch, but some prospect holes were excavated. Interviews with older, long-time residents conducted as a part of the cultural resource assessment for the project (Appendix F) indicate that the gold recovered from these "bull quartz" vein prospect holes was not great.

Page 10-17, first full sentence is amended:

County lease laws, project site deed restrictions, and club rules prohibiting free-roaming dogs could be enacted, and the club security patrol could be required to assure compliance.

Page 11-6, paragraph 4, add:

Only the club facilities, excluding the golf course, are within the reservoir's watershed; see Figure 11-2. All of the golfing/housing project would be in the watersheds
of creeks, rivers, and irrigation canals of the foothills and Central Valley.

Page 12-8

Figure 12-2 is revised (attached).

Page 12-15, paragraph 2, add sentence:

A lengthened left-turn lane may be required to accommodate traffic turning left on La Grange Road from Route 120-108.

Page 12-16, add:

The developer's appropriate cost of all traffic improvements expected to be needed by buildout of Phase I, based on the relative traffic generation information described in this chapter, can be estimated by the project engineer (subject to county approval). The developer could then be required to finance an immediate road hazard improvement project at that approximate total cost.

Page 12-16, 3rd paragraph, add:

To alleviate the backup of cars on Bonds Flat Road near the project entrance, require that the project entry road and station be designed to allow for complete queuing of automobiles within the project site during peak arrival periods.

Page E-6

Change "Wild oaks" to "Wild oats".
January 8, 1987

Mr. Tony Lashbrook
Mariposa County Planning Department
P. O. Box 2039
Mariposa, CA 95338

Dear Tony:

Enclosed please find an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro. This should provide an adequate response to the few outstanding issues described in your letter of December 31, 1986 to the Tuolumne County Planning Department. It should allow both counties to now move forward in formulating specific recommendations for this project.

If we may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Ken Casaday

Enclosure
ADDENDUM TO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SOUTH SHORE CLUB AT LAKE DON PEDRO

Prepared for:
Tuolumne and Mariposa Counties

Submitted by:
Jones & Stokes Associates
1725 - 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816

January 1987
The following is an addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro, December 1986. It has been prepared to clarify or expand upon responses to comments received from the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors (see Final EIR, comment document 16, on p. II-46) as requested by the Mariposa County Planning Department on December 31, 1986. The addendum also includes a correction regarding solid waste disposal services in Tuolumne County.

Addenda to Section II, Comments on the DEIR and Responses to Comments:

The following persons commented on the FEIR. Their comments, and the responses to them, follow sequentially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Comment Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Lashbrook, Associate Planner, Mariposa County Planning Department</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Tremewan, Manager, Jamestown Landfill, Tuolumne County</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 31, 1986

John Anderson
Tuolumne County Planning Department
2 South Green St.
Sonora, CA 95370

Re: Input on the Adequacy of the responses to comments on the DEIR for the South Shore Club at Lake Don Pedro

Dear Mr. Anderson:

This letter contains Mariposa County's input on the adequacy of the responses prepared by Jones & Stokes for inclusion into the final EIR for the South Shore project. These responses are provided in accordance with Section 14 of the environmental impact report processing agreement entered into by Mariposa and Tuolumne County.

1. Section III of Final EIR pages 6 and 7

Paragraph 2 on page 7 conflicts with the last paragraph on the same page. Such conflicts should not exist within the document. Further clarification regarding this matter is necessary.

2. Comment 5-C from Mariposa County (page II-47 of F.E.I.R.) indicates that a lack of available fire fighting manpower complicates the impact on fire fighting services. The manpower issue was not discussed in the responses to comments and therefore the response is not adequate.

3. Comment 8 A from Mariposa County (page II-48, F.E.I.R.) requests additional discussion of potential land use conflicts between the project and other existing and future land uses in the area which are provided for by the County General Plan.

The consultant refers to the existing sections in the DEIR in his response to this comment. These sections do not adequately address the potential conflicts because they do not detail the permitted uses on adjacent lands. The Mountain General Land Use which would be contiguous to the residential development allows for unlimited agricultural, mining, and light industrial uses, all of which could conflict with the residential project. The proposed open space area

2
may provide adequate mitigation for land use conflicts, however, it is not discussed in detail in the E.I.R. Additional discussion of the potential for land use impacts and appropriate mitigation measures should be provided in the EIR. This section should address both the effects on residential development within the project site and the effects on adjacent lands.

A complete discussion of potential land use conflicts and associated impacts is important as the project involves a General Plan Amendment.

A copy of portions of a previously certified EIR involving an amendment of similar General Plan Land Uses is provided for the consultants information.

If you or the EIR consultant should have any questions regarding these comments, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

TONY LASHBROOK
Associate Planner

TL:bc
enclosure
cc: Jones & Stokes/
     Don Beck
     Gary Wood
Response 17-1

The commentator states that the proposed mitigation measure involving the funding of school bus service in Mariposa County with the project developer's assistance is in conflict with the new school impaction fee legislation (AB 2926). The latter establishes that specified impact fees (related to square footage of development) are to be "the exclusive method of mitigating environmental effects related to the adequacy of school facilities . . ." (emphasis added). School buses are not included in the definition of facilities (Meyers pers. comm.); thus, the proposed busing cost-sharing mitigation is not precluded by the new legislation.

The second paragraph on page III-7 of the FEIR should be clarified by the addition of: "on school facilities" after "the legislation requires that no developer fees other than those described above can be instituted to offset 'significant effects' of new development."

The following reference should be added to the "Personal Communications" portion of Chapter 19, Bibliography


Response 17-2

According to James McGee of Fire Protection Planning, Tuolumne County Fire Department (1-7-87), staffing levels at the Blanchard Station are identical to the county-wide average (10 volunteers per station). A shortage of manpower does not now exist and is not anticipated with project development. Inadequate pumping capacity to meet the project's fire protection needs is the only identified fire protection issue of the proposed project; see Comment Letter 8 and Response 8-1 of the FEIR.

Response 17-3

The commentator feels that more analysis of land use compatibility between the proposed project and existing uses or possible future projects on adjacent lands should be provided in the FEIR. Two separate issues are apparently of concern: 1) effects of the project on existing land uses in the area, and 2) the potential for conflict between project land use and those adjacent land uses that may be allowed under the current General Plan land use designations.
The FEIR adequately addresses item (1) above, as noted in Response 16-8.A on p. II-53 (referring to the discussions on pages 5-17 and 5-18 of the DEIR).

With regard to possible future development on adjoining lands, the following section should be added to the FEIR on p. 5-18 of the DEIR:

**Potential Conflicts with Future Adjoining Land Uses**

Future land uses on adjoining lands that would be compatible with existing General Plan designations of the two counties include agriculture, residential use, mining, and light industrial use. Although some designations allow all of these uses, they are not necessarily compatible when in proximity to one another (contrary to Mariposa County General Plan Amendment No. 82-4-6 FEIR).

The project open space would generally provide a buffer 400-1,000 feet wide between the project and adjacent ownerships. (An exception is the northwest portion of the proposed development where residential use to the property boundary is planned.) This buffer zone should be adequate to prevent conflicts between project uses and allowable uses on immediately adjacent lands, unless large-scale mining is proposed. Since the mineral potential of the area appears to be less than significant (see FEIR p. II-54), adjacent large-scale mining is unlikely to occur.

A mitigation measure should be added to p. 5-19 of the DEIR:

**Subject Proposed Mining in Areas with Residential Use to a Special Use Permit Process**

Where zoning district provisions allow residential uses "by right," mining should be allowed by special permit, thus assuring a public participation process that can protect the health, safety, and welfare of existing residents and adjoining property owners.
Report of Telephone Conversation:

Caller: John Anderson, Planner II, Tuolumne County Planning Department, relaying written message of B. Tremewan, R. S., Manager of Jamestown Landfill, County of Tuolumne.

Date: Call on January 1, 1987 reporting letter of December 23, 1986.

Message: Citizens can also dispose of waste directly at the Jamestown (and Groveland) landfill. Mariposa County citizens can dispose of waste at Tuolumne County facilities if the required fee is paid. If the South Shore Club wishes to collect and haul waste, it would have to be certified by the County for this purpose.
Response 18-1

The submitted information supplements the discussion of solid waste disposal in the DEIR and FEIR. It should be considered to be an amendment of the DEIR on p. 8-24 through 8-27 (as amended by the FEIR).