

The Wildhorse Ranch EIR should take into account and analyze the following issues/impacts:

- 1) Loss of agricultural lands: The 1994 Wildhorse Project EIR required that the project proponent permanently preserve equivalent acreage of similar agricultural lands in the immediate area of the development. This is a feasible mitigation measure for the Wildhorse Ranch project, too. 25 acres of the land formerly known as Shriners (immediately East of the Wildhorse Ranch) would be an appropriate area to preserve. In addition, since the specific lands were to be identified after the Wildhorse EIR was certified, staff should confirm that Wildhorse Ranch was not identified as mitigation for the Wildhorse Project. If it was, then double the acreage would be required for adequate mitigation for the Wildhorse Ranch project.
- 2) Sensitive species: LSA's Supplemental Biological Survey dated June 23, 1994 identified three sensitive species for the Wildhorse Project area, which included the Wildhorse Ranch. Swainson's Hawks were found nesting within ¼ mile, and the Wildhorse Ranch site was identified as foraging habitat. Giant Garter Snake was found to have suitable habitat in Covell drain (and presumably Channel A, too). These waterbodies are rarely, if ever, dry now, probably as a result of increased summer runoff from the Wildhorse development. This has rendered these waterbodies that are in close proximity to Wildhorse Ranch suitable year-round habitat for the Giant Garter Snake. Elderberry trees may exist on Wildhorse Ranch. If so, they should be protected as habitat for the beetle that relies upon them. Finally, the land to the east of the proposed project is burrowing owl nesting habitat. This habitat should be maintained and protected during construction.
- 3) Traffic Impacts: The initial study misses two important roadway system elements on Pole Line Road to study. Many residents of the proposed project will travel south to the Safeway supermarket on the south side of Interstate 80. In addition, with the existing Home Depot and Walmart on Main near Road 102, and imminent construction of a Costco and other major retail facilities on Road 102 at Interstate 5, many residents will travel north on Pole Line and continue as it becomes Road 102 all the way to Interstate 5.
- 4) Existing baseline for CEQA analysis: The baseline for purposes of analyzing the Wildhorse Ranch proposed project's impacts should be the existing horse ranch at its historically low level of use, but with the assumption that it is in compliance with the March 29, 2000 "Wildhorse Horse Ranch Management Plan." That management plan was a required mitigation measure for the Wildhorse Project. The management plan has not been fully implemented by the former or current owners of the Wildhorse Ranch. However, compliance with the management plan would reduce odors, dust, vectors, and other impacts to an insignificant level. Therefore, the analysis in the Wildhorse Ranch EIR should not confer a benefit of noncompliance to the owners by assuming that the proposed project would lessen any of the impacts associated with the existing use. To the contrary, many of the neighbors view the existing horse ranch, properly operated, as an enhancement to their properties, as it conveys both a pastoral setting and open space values.

- 5) Parks: The greenbelt in the proposed project should contain some park facilities such as playstructures and large fields, in order to reduce the additional demand on the only such park in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project: the small neighborhood park on Ducheny Street.
- 6) Visual Resources: The existing homes on the East and South side of Caravaggio Drive would be adjacent to the proposed project. The existing homes have very shallow backyards, but most of the residents currently enjoy unobstructed open space views from their backyards. In addition to deeding the twenty feet of additional backyard space to the existing residents, another feasible mitigation measure would include limiting the new homes on the north and west perimeter to either one-story homes, or two-story homes with much greater rear setbacks than would be possible with 5,000 square feet homes on the proposed (very small) lots.
- 7) Property deeded to the neighbors: The EIR should fully analyze both possibilities that are reasonably foreseeable: either that twenty feet will be deeded to the neighbors to extend their backyards, or that a twenty-foot open space corridor would be created behind the existing backyards. Deeding the twenty feet would mitigate some of the visual impacts to the neighbors, as would the creation of a corridor. However, a narrow open space corridor would decrease privacy and increase crime and noise to the neighbors, because it could be used by individuals to move among the houses without being detected. These impacts need to be analyzed, especially in light of the recent substantial increase in robberies and other crimes in the adjacent portion of the existing Wildhorse development.
- 8) Growth-inducing impacts: The EIR should acknowledge that the proposed project will make it much more likely that the agricultural fields immediately to the east (known as Shriners) will be developed. This is because the Shriners field currently is bounded on the south side by development, but the proposed project would result in the Shriners' field being surrounded by development on two sides. Therefore, the Shriners' field would no longer be leapfrog development, and it is likely that the proposed-project would induce development of the Shriners' field.
- 9) Stormwater runoff volume: The proposed project will increase runoff from the area, and includes detention of three acre-feet on site during a 10-year peak runoff. The EIR should describe stormwater runoff capacity issues during a 100-year event, too. The EIR should analyze the ability to increase the capacity of the Covell Drain to handle the increased runoff as an alternative to allowing standing water to remain onsite during rain events. Given the very limited percolation in areal soils, it should not be assumed that any standing water will percolate into the ground. Also, it is not at all clear that there is enough area on-site to create such a substantial amount of detention area without flooding the entire greenspace and buffer area. Using the buffer area would potentially flood the burrowing owl nest sites, and would also increase the opportunity for mosquito habitat.
- 10) Bicycle and pedestrian traffic: Without the proposed project, children attempting to cross Covell will be able to avoid all major intersections by using the planned undercrossing to the east of the Wildhorse Ranch. With the project, they will have to cross the major ingress/egress intersection(s) at the project. This impact can and should be mitigated by paving a section of the gravel path in the eastern portion of the proposed project so that it connects the undercrossing to a bicycle

path running through the proposed project's greenspace connection to the existing development.

- 11) Public transportation: The Yolo bus Sacramento commuter routes are already at standing-room only capacity. The proposed project will increase ridership, which may require the addition of another bus line.
- 12) Sewage treatment plant capacity: The EIR should analyze whether the proposed project will utilize limited additional capacity to the detriment of other potential development in Davis.
- 13) Agricultural impacts: The proposed project should include improved windrow plantings to minimize dust and noise. In addition, the 500-foot buffer from aerial applications that was required in the 1994 Wildhorse Project EIR should be confirmed as still in effect and effective.
- 14) Greenhouse gas generation: The EIR should consider as a mitigation measure mandating a particular level of compliance with the Davis Green Points checklist, or other methods for requiring minimal energy consumption.

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

From: Ike Njoku [mailto:INjoku@ci.davis.ca.us]

Sent: Monday, July 30, 2007 7:53 AM

To: LWESTR@parks.ca.gov

Cc: MurrayL@aol.com; Mitch Sears; Michael Webb; Leslie.Holzman@dhcs.ca.gov; ddelapena@mognot.com; rlefl@parks.ca.gov; WWEST@parks.ca.gov; Nick Pappani; maryruiz@yahoo-inc.com

Subject: Re: Wildhorse Horse Ranch comment

Thank you Laura. I've passed on your comments below via the ccs.

Ike

>>> Westrup, Laura 07/30/07 7:52 AM >>>

Ike, I understand that the City Council's plan to preserve an agricultural buffer around the City contains a key loophole meaning that the proposed Wildhorse Horse Ranch development would not be required to have adjacent mitigation. This one quarter mile agricultural buffer around the development is what Davis residents expect and it baffles me that the Wildhorse Horse Ranch development would be exempt from this buffer. I would like my question or issue of the quarter mile agricultural buffer land addressed as part of the CEQA process. By not having the agricultural buffer land adjacent to this new development mean that the potential for growth increases?

Thank you.

Laura Westrup

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

From: Ike Njoku <INjoku@ci.davis.ca.us>
To: kukchow@hotmail.com <kukchow@hotmail.com>
CC: Nick Pappani
Sent: Wed Aug 01 07:31:11 2007
Subject: Re: Scope of EIR on Wildhorse Ranch Project

Thank you. I've forwarded your comments to the EIR consultant.

Ike

>>> KuK Chow 08/01/07 12:19 AM >>>

Dear Ike

I propose that the scope of the EIR on the Wildhorse Ranch Project shall include :-

- (1) the impact on the adjacent wildlife habitat ;
- (2) the impact on traffic on East Covell Blvd and in the nearby neighborhood ; and
- (3) the impact on little children playing on Caravaggio Drive and Caravaggio Place.

By the way, I would be grateful if you could send me by email all the comments received so far about this project as you promised at the meeting on July 18. We noticed that some comments have been omitted from the pages of comments that were distributed to us.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly

Kuk Chow

<http://im.live.com/messenger/im/home/?source=hmtxtlinkjuly07>

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

From: Ike Njoku [mailto:INjoku@ci.davis.ca.us]

Sent: Friday, August 03, 2007 9:02 AM

To: jjohnson2732@mac.com

Cc: Michael Webb; Nick Pappani

Subject: Re: Wildhorse Ranch Project - EIR Scoping Meeting Comments

Thank you Jerry & Deedra. Your comments will be forwarded to the EIR Consultant.

Ike

Ike Njoku, Planner/Historical Resources Manager
City of Davis Community Development Department
23 Russell Blvd.
Davis, CA 95616
injoku@cityofdavis.org
Phone: (530) 757-5610
Fax: (530) 757-5660

>>> Jerry Johnson 08/03/07 8:53 AM >>>

Hello Ike,

Hopefully this will for work for comments for the Wildhorse Ranch Project EIR Scoping Meeting draft:

- 1) How will the noise from the generator for the irrigation pump going to be dealt with? It's adjacent to the property and runs 24/7 for about 5 months in the spring (I don't recall if it runs in the fall too).
- 2) The horse ranch was identified as a commitment to open space. How will this project preserve that commitment? What would happen if it was considered for development when the Shriner's property is developed.
- 3) Why would this development be better (more responsible to the neighborhood) than a legitimate commitment to a viable and well maintained horse ranch since no one has seriously tried it?

4) The proposal has too many units. What if the number of units was significantly reduced and relatively small 1-story houses on larger lots (similar to some of the developments in the 50's) so the homes would be less expensive but there would be enough room on the lot to expand in the future. This would allow for a mix of home sizes and prices in the future.

5) What will be the effect of the additional foot traffic along the habitat area trail with respect to wildlife and security for existing residents?

6) Will new occupants be reminded that there are a significant number of coyotes in the area and they will most likely lose pets?

7) Given the low quality of landscape maintenance (including irrigation) of existing roadway and entrance area plantings, how can the City possibly take on any new parks or roadway landscape maintenance responsibilities?

8) The new development should blend very well with the eastern portion of the existing Wildhorse development without hampering the first floor views of the current residents.

9) Was support for the project miss-represented to the Council when it voted to approve the preparation of the EIR? Comments in our meetings would indicate that to be the case. Was that comment included in the latest Minutes of those meetings?

Thank to you and Katherine for the opportunity to comment early in the process. I'm sure that all of these are not relevant to the EIR but they are issues none the less.

Jerry & Deedra Johnson
2732 Bellows St.



MARK B HORTON, MD, MSPH
Director

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
California Department of Public Health



ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
Governor

July 27, 2007

Ike Njoku
City of Davis
23 Russell Boulevard
Davis, CA 95616

RECEIVED

City of Davis
Planning & Building

RE: Wildhorse Ranch – SCH#2007072020

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) is in receipt of the Notice of Preparation for the above project.

If the City of Davis plans to develop a new water supply well or make modifications to the existing domestic water treatment system to serve the Wildhorse Ranch project site, an application to amend the water system permit must be reviewed and approved by the CDPH Sacramento District Office. These future developments may be subject to separate environmental review.

Please contact the office at (916) 449-5600 for further information.

Sincerely,

Bridget Binning
California Department of Public Health
Environmental Review Unit

Cc:

Terry Macaulay, District Engineer
CDHS Sacramento
1616 Capitol Avenue, MS 7407
Sacramento, CA 95899

State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044



RECEIVED

100 4 1 2011

City of Davis
Planning & Building

Mr. Ike Njoku, Planner
City of Davis
Community Development Department
23 Russell Blvd.
Davis, CA 95616

Re: Affordable Housing – Wildhorse Ranch Proposal

Dear Mr. Njoku

The current proposal for the Wildhorse Ranch development appears to provide for medium and low income housing. Habitat for Humanity, Yolo County supports the inclusion of home ownership opportunities for Yolo County's very low income families. In the 2000 census, 18% of the County's households lived in poverty. Providing home ownership to this segment of the population is an opportunity to break the chain of poverty and provide a clean, safe environment for our neediest families.

Habitat for Humanity, Yolo County is interested in establishing a pilot program of one or two affordable four-plexes for very low income families using green technology. This program would utilize UCD's green research and development in cooperation with our campus student chapter. The Wildhorse Ranch development would be an excellent opportunity to bring together green development and affordable housing for our very low income families.

There are few opportunities in Yolo County for affordable home ownership for the very low income segment of our population and we think more should and can be done to address this concern. Through volunteer labor, interest free loans, and the generosity of our many supporters, we are able to provide home ownership with mortgage payments comparable to subsidized rentals.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wayne Eckert".

Wayne Eckert
President – Habitat for Humanity, Yolo County
Telephone: 530.757.1202

**WILDHORSE RANCH PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) SCOPING MEETING**

RECEIVED

COMMENT FORM

1111 21 2007

City of Davis
Planning & Building

To be added/corrected on our mailing list and to document the author of comments received, please provide the following information. Thank you.

Name: Ranjit Maan

Address: 2556 Caravaggio Dr. Davis, CA 95618

Organization: Neighbor to Wildhorse Horse Ranch

Please provide us with your written comments on the Scope of the EIR by **5:00 pm, August 3, 2007.**

Wildhorse Horse Ranch development project, I think is not a desirable neither beneficial venture for Davis to undertake because:

1. On east end of Covell Blvd. it would create a traffic problem at peak traffic times. It's location at East end where 90% of the cars still headed to the west part of town (will block traffic) not a good idea.
2. Plasticity of clay soil can create swelling pressure in clay - not a desirable place to build houses - houses will have cracked floors.
3. I see so many signs in town and ads in the newspapers about apartments for rent and house for sale. Do we need more houses and apartments especially when school and university enrollment is dropping?
4. By the time cost of public services and utilities is added to the price of the house - that house will no longer be affordable for low-income families.

(Prior to mailing this form, please fold form so that address on back is clearly visible, and attach necessary postage)

I suggest, the city of Davis should pick ~~the~~ "No Project Alternative"

RECEIVED

Wildhorse Ranch Subdivision EIR Scoping Comments

AUG 03 2007

**Respondent: Brian McAloon, Davis, CA
8/3/07**

**City of Davis
Planning & Building**

As background, please note that my property on Caravaggio Dr. shares a common property line with the Wildhorse Horse Ranch, I purchased my house in 2000, and I am the original owner of my property.

Comments in response to the 7/5/07 "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Wildhorse Ranch Project" issued by the City of Davis (City); items are numbered in accordance with items in the "Initial Study" section included in the Report:

VII Project Description

Page 14 describes proposed residential housing units as including Live/Work Units.

1. Does the City consider Live/Work Units to be consistent with existing housing in Wildhorse?
2. Are the Live/Work Units designed to allow occupants to work there?
3. If so, will the City restrict occupancy to only those people who telecommute or who operate businesses from these Units?
4. How is operating a business in the proposed development consistent with the current land use of Wildhorse?
5. The current proposal does not appear to specifically identify commercial land use within the proposed development. Does the City acknowledge that commercial activities may occur on the proposed development?

Page 14 describes proposed residential housing units as including Affordable Housing Units.

1. Does the City require at least some of these Affordable Housing Units to be rental units?
2. If so, what exact percentage of all proposed Affordable Housing Units on the proposed development will these comprise?
3. Does the City require at least some of these Affordable Housing Units to be owner-occupied with a deed restriction limiting occupancy to only owners?
4. If so, what exact percentage of all proposed Affordable Housing Units on the proposed development will these comprise?

IX Environmental Checklist / I. Aesthetics

1. I currently enjoy a direct unobstructed view of the tall buildings of downtown Sacramento, the Old Sacramento area along the river (including fireworks displays when they occur) and the Sierra Nevada mountain range. These features can be enjoyed from inside my house as well as from my backyard, and were a significant determining factor in my decision to purchase my property. What steps will the City take to ensure that these features are not obstructed?
2. The southward view from my property allows me to enjoy the rural characteristics of the Wildhorse Ranch in its current Open Space condition. What steps will be taken to mitigate the loss of this feature?

IX Environmental Checklist / III. Air Quality

1. The current proposal for 259 units may result in a significant source of air pollution originating from automobiles being used and parked by occupant of the proposed development. What steps will be taken to mitigate this pollution?

IX Environmental Checklist / IX. Land Use and Planning

1. Is the density of housing in the proposed development consistent with that currently existing in Wildhorse?
2. Does the City feel it is important for the housing density of the proposed development to be consistent with that currently existing in Wildhorse?

IX Environmental Checklist / XI. Noise

1. I currently enjoy very low noise levels originating from the Wildhorse Ranch in its current Open Space configuration. What measures will the City require in order to ensure that levels of noise reaching my property and generated from the proposed development will not be any higher than current levels reaching my property from the current land use activities at the Wildhorse Ranch?

IX Environmental Checklist / XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

1. I currently notice frequent drops in water pressure occurring at periods of peak usage (mornings, evenings). What steps will be taken to mitigate this and ensure that this situation does not worsen?