Letter 25

Ralph E. Coleman
3425 Cimmeron Court
Rocklin, California 95677

Saturday, March 04, 2006

David Mohlenbrok
Planning Services Director
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677-2720

Re: Comments on Environmental Impact Report
Clover Valley

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Re-circulated Environmental Impact Report for the Clover Valley Project.

During our recent combined City Council and Planning Commission public comment forum we were fortunate to hear a small number of local residents give their constructive comments regarding the proposed EIR. Of particular concern were public comments regarding:

25-1

- Section 4.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality – analysis of downstream negative health impacts due to the increased use and runoff of pesticides.
- Section 4.6 – Noise – noise study not actually done in the valley.

However, the large majority in attendance preferred to voice their opinions pro and con on the proposed development rather than the EIR.

I understand that both are important, however as we move through future meetings on this project, all will have ample time in which to discuss project specifics. Having had the opportunity for both verbal and written comments on the EIR, I see little need for an extension of said comment period.

EIR Comment:

Section 4.11: Hydrology and Water Quality.

25-2

While this subject seems to be addressed adequately within the project's boundaries, I feel that additional analysis and mitigation considerations be give to the sedimentation impacts this project will have downstream of the projects boundaries. Specifically, the sedimentation impacts on the Whitney Oaks irrigation pond.
Increased sedimentation (from upstream) has been the cause of said pond's inability to hold and process heavy rainfalls in the past leading to flooding and subsequent property damage.
A finding of Less-Than-Significant seems irresponsible without additional monitoring mitigation measures.

25-3

I would also like to see additional data and discussion on the impacts of traffic from Bickford Ranch on this project.

Regards,

Ralph E. Coleman
Planning Commissioner
City of Rocklin

LETTER 25: COLEMAN, RALPH E., PLANNING COMMISSIONER

Response to Comment 25-1

The comment refers to public comment pertaining to hydrology and noise, but does not provide specific comment on the adequacy of the RDEIR in addressing those issues.

Response to Comment 25-2

The project would not contribute increased sediment loads downstream, and should reduce the sediment loading at the downstream irrigation pond due to a reduction in stormwater flow velocity after construction of the project's two detention basins. See Table 4.11-2 on page 4.11-12 which sets forth a summary of existing and post-development stormwater flows in Clover Valley Creek. Impacts 4.11I-3 through 4.11I-7 discuss how the project will deal with sediment control and sets forth mitigation measures to ensure the project does not contribute to increased sediment loading in Clover Valley Creek.

The in-line detention basins described in Section 1 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality will result in runoff from about 20 percent of the project area being detained. The majority of the sediment in the detained runoff will settle out in the detention basin and will not be conveyed into Clover Valley Creek and farther downstream. The project additionally includes the installation of 17 water quality treatment systems equivalent to the Stormwater 360 StormFilter unit. These units will remove sediment from the developed areas of the project. Thus, after construction, some of the sediment that is currently conveyed downstream will be captured by the treatment systems and the detention basins. Nevertheless, some sediment will continue to be conveyed downstream of the development area as occurs under existing conditions. Also, a long-term water quality monitoring program (including suspended sediment) will be implemented to document if increased sediment transport off the development site occurs as a result of the project.

Response to Comment 25-3

Development at Bickford Ranch was included in the 2025 Current General Plan and 2025 Current General Plan Plus-Project scenarios that were used in the Project's traffic study. Growth in traffic includes development within the City of Rocklin as well as development outside the City. The travel demand model used for this analysis is a regional model that extends beyond the boundaries of the Project area.

Letter 26

DRY CREEK CONSERVANCY

"Where do rivers start?"
In threads in hills and gather to here—
but the river is all of it everywhere,
all flowing at once,
all one place.
— Gary Snyder

916 771-2013
P.O. BOX 1311 ROSEVILLE, CA 95678-8311

March 3, 2006

RECEIVED
MAR 13 2006
SCA

Sherri Abbas
Planning Services Manager
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

Re: Clover Valley Lakes Project DEIR

Dear Ms Abbas,

26-1 This letter provides Dry Creek Conservancy (DCC) comments on Clover Valley Lakes Project SD-98-05 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). These comments supplement statements given by David Baker, DCC Monitoring Coordinator, at the recent combined public meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission. Upon reviewing the DEIR, we believe project implementation will present serious technical challenges because of its large impact on this diminutive and ecologically fragile space.

Executive Summary

26-2 Explicit performance measures are needed to control construction activities to prevent wet-season pollution from entering the wetlands. We applaud the use of Low Impact Development (LID) principles to reduce fine sediments, but DCC further recommends "rain gardens" and "grassy swells" to help mitigate nutrients runoff which, otherwise, would be expected to cause excessive algae growth (eutrification) in the creek.

26-3 DCC's appended five-years of water quality data suggests that Clover Valley Creek is generally healthy but on the brink of biological concern because of some stressors. The funding of perpetual monitoring of creek hydrology, as recommended in the DEIR (4.11-13), should be instituted. DCC recommends the use of in-stream loggers for depth (flow) and several conventional water quality parameters.

26-4 Critical Habitat for California Central Valley Steelhead designation applies to Clover Valley Creek because of recent changes in federal regulations. DCC believes that the City of Rocklin is obligated to require a minimum 75 foot buffer zone because of the above designation. However, a 100 foot setback would provide better protection for native species and wetlands, according to a 2005 Jones and Stokes report. Fish passage improvement should be funded to help mitigate downstream damage (in Clover Valley Creek and Antelope Creek) to salmon and steelhead habitat anticipated by this project.

Letter 26 cont'd

26-5 Constructing roadways as temporary levees, to reduce downstream peak flows during major storms (100-year), is expected to cause major down-cutting of the creek and to compromise existing water quality. The floodplain's sandy substrate suggests the potential for catastrophic failure, unless roads and other structures are built to levee standards. Off-stream detention is also more effective at retaining storm surges than in-stream designs. If off-stream retention basins can not be constructed within the confines of this narrow valley, then the scale of the project should be radically reduced as mitigation.

Appendix I (Biological Impacts)

Construction Impacts to Riparian and Aquatic Habitats

26-6 The construction process alone at this ecologically fragile site has the potential of causing significant and permanent damage. Contouring of the land is a major risk for increasing the amount of soil runoff into the creek. There is also the potential for oil and fuel contamination from heavy equipment and machinery during construction.

26-7 Decreased water quality in creeks, due to high levels of sediment runoff from residential construction, has been a repeated problem in the City of Rocklin in recent years (Barrington Hills in 2002, Southside Ranch Road in 2004, and Stanford Ranch & Sunset in 2006). Some builders have aggressively pursued construction activities during the wet season. With required BMPs in place by October 15th, site grading, road building and other soil disturbance activities need to be prevented until June 1st! The statement that: "SWPPP… be designed to prevent sediment loads greater than ten percent of the background levels during construction," is good if this can be expressed as turbidity units, a parameter easily measured in the field (e.g.: NTU) by construction inspectors.

26-8 Suitable management controls need to be identified and rigorously enforced to halt all inappropriate wet-season construction activities for preventing gross water pollution. Once upland terrain is disturbed, it becomes especially prone to storm runoff. The builder must be motivated to prevent sediment from entering the creek, because once deposited it will cause serious sediment problems for years if not decades. The City of Rocklin should consider the use of a mandatory 60-day work stoppage for egregious violations by builders.

Low Impact Development

26-9 DCC is pleased that the DEIR presents a serious attempt to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) principles into the project design. Use of advanced storm drain filters to reduce fine sediments is critical for controlling on-going stream turbidity. The stormwater360" type system would remove heavy sediments, but the "StormFilter" filtration system would be more attractive since this type of product significantly reduces fine sediments as well as some toxic compounds (e.g.: pyrethroids and heavy metals). DCC recommends use of "rain gardens and grassy swells to keep runoff from lawns, roofs and paved services on-site and out of the creek; without this mitigation additional nutrients are expected to cause excessive algae growth (eutrophication).

Letter 26 cont'd

Dry Creek Conservancy
Comments on Clover Valley Lakes Project DEIR

Special Status Fish (Pgs. 7 and 37)

The National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion on May 9, 2002 has been eclipsed by changes to its rules in 2005 (70 FR 52488, 9/2/05; 63 FR 13347, 3/19/98; 1/2/05). Clover Valley Creek is now considered critical habitat for California Central Valley Steelhead, regardless whether or not fish are currently found in the stream.

26-10 There is documentation in *Streams of Western Placer County-Literature Review*, 3/3/04; (http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning/legacy/streams-lit-review/streams-lit-review.htm) that the lower reaches of Clover Valley Creek had fall-run salmon as recently as the early 1960s. Salmon were also observed just below the confluence of Clover Valley Creek and Antelope Creek in 2004. Steelhead spawning normally occurs a month or so later than salmon and during higher flows. Although not usually seen because of higher flows, steelhead are typically successful in traveling further up streams than salmon.

Fish Passage Mitigation

Although the study correctly identifies the presence of significant downstream barriers to the migration of Steelhead and Chinook salmon, another anadromous fish species, Pacific Lamprey would be expected to overcome many natural and man-made impediments.

On page 40 it states: "The Corps shall encourage implementation of measures to provide upstream fish passage through Clover Valley Creek by replacing downstream barriers to migration such as the culvert at Argonaut Road." One of the goals of the DCC and the Dry Creek Watershed Council is to remove fish passage barriers in Dry Creek and its tributaries, including Antelope Creek and Clover Valley Creek.

26-11 The proposed in-stream detention suggests using box culverts for the bridge structures; culverts with a concrete bottom are known to create fish passage problems as down-cutting occurs below these structure over time. One suspects, even if the bridge culverts have a natural bottom, that the creek would eventually become channelized with the additional flashiness of the flows due to the increased impervious surfaces. Restriction of natural stream meandering with road and bridge construction will also cause incision of the creek. Excessive sand build-up within retention basins is a long-term maintenance issue that needs to be funded.

This project will certainly compromise downstream spawning and rearing habitat for native salmon and steelhead, and presents the likelihood of creating more fish barriers because of changes in flow patterns. As an appropriate mitigation measure, DCC recommends that five fish passage improvement projects (Argonaut Road, Sunset Avenue and three other sites) be funded by Clover Valley Lakes.

Riparian and Aquatic Habitats Buffer Zones

26-12 The applicant is requesting a rezone to the General Plan to encroach in to the 50 foot setback (page 3-20 of DEIR). This will not provide sufficient protection to the creek and the active floodplain. There should be no creek-side development because impacts on the creek and its watershed are potentially disastrous to native habitat and wildlife.

March 3, 2006 3

Letter 26 cont'd

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) recommended in their NOP comment letter: "eliminating any and all proposed urban development proposed immediately adjacent to Clover Valley Creek (lots 71-95)." Further they said "that this alternative design would reduce project impacts due to fragmentation, allow for continued animal movement along Clover Valley Creek, be consistent with a potential Placer County conservation strategy, and be scientifically defensible."

A setback of 50 feet is not compliant the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requirements since the agency recommends a minimum of 75 feet. The Biological Opinion on May 9, 2002 has been eclipsed by changes to agency's rules in 2005 (70 FR 52488, 9/2/05; 63 FR 13347, 3/19/98; 1/2/05). Responding to a court order, NMFS amended its regulations which do apply to the current project. The City of Rocklin is obligated to require the minimum 75 foot buffer zone, as recommended by NMFS.

26-12 cont'd

Because of the large scale of the project presented in the DEIR and subsequent development anticipated in this confined valley, DCC believes even a larger setback is appropriate to minimize direct damage to Clover Valley Creek and downstream Antelope Creek. As cited in a Jones and Stokes report, dated February, 2005, *Setback Recommendation to Conserve Riparian Areas and Streams in Western Placer County*, "...that riparian setbacks include the entire active floodplain, regardless of the current extent of riparian vegetation on that surface, and that an additional 30 m (98 ft) buffer be included within the setback. This width should be sufficient to substantially slow or infiltrate much of the runoff from adjacent uplands, and to remove excessive sediment from that runoff prior to it's entering the active floodplain." DCC recommends a set back of 100 feet beyond the creek and active flood plain as the superior alternative.

Creek markers should be installed to alert homeowners from mowing, plantings and disturbing the open space. Residential and roadway lighting will greatly impact wildlife and needs to be mitigated with low level lighting on residential (and commercial) properties adjacent to open space and along all roadways within the project.

Road and Bridge Construction

26-13

The three elevated bridge crossings over the creek across this small valley floor may inhibit movement of wildlife, disrupt cooling groundwater flows into the creek (needed for summer refuge for future steelhead) and impact the aesthetics of Clover Valley Creek's riparian corridor.

Tree Removal

26-14

The removal of a significant number of oak trees, especially Blue Oaks, is of major ecological concern. Loss of Blue Oak woodlands in the foothill ecoregion is an acknowledged problem. The tree loss on commercial property should not be omitted from tree loss calculations and should be mitigated. Trees damaged by sewer line installation should also be mitigated.

Mitigation for oak tree loss in recent years has been poorly documented in many communities, and success of mitigation is largely unknown. Funds set up to facilitate

Letter 26 cont'd

26-14 cont'd

tree removal permits by fee collection have been inadequate to implement mitigation because specific locations for tree planting haven't been identified and rising land prices have made purchase of land for preserves infeasible. Specific locations for the mitigation of oak tree loss should be identified and a monitoring program should be required to assess success of mitigation. Maintenance of the mitigation trees should be required until success of the mitigation measures is confirmed.

26-15

Appendix K & L (Geological and Geotechnical/Engineering Report)
DCC is concerned that upland landscaping irrigation, within the Mehrten formation, may induce artificial recharge with seepage at low elevations causing tree kills (native oaks can't tolerate damp roots during the summer).

26-16

Using roadways across the floodplain as temporary levees to reduce downstream peak flows during major storms (100-year) is not an ecologically viable option. DCC does not believe that in-stream retention should be used because of the destructive environmental consequences to normal stream function and water quality.

Appendix P (Water Quality)
Five-years of water quality data (appended document) indicate Clover Valley Creek to be generally healthy but also indicate the stream to be seasonally marginal for some parameters (turbidity, nutrients, copper, bacteria and temperature).

26-17

Unless suitable LID features are installed, stormwater runoff, containing sediment, toxic chemicals and nutrients will enter Clover Valley Creek after project completion. DCC also expects an in-stream retention basin to cause channel cutting and bank erosion within the creek, regardless if the bridge culverts have concrete bottoms or not. The result will increase turbidity, water temperature and promote algae growth, which will lead to wide diurnal swings in dissolved oxygen and pH.

Because of the potential for this development to reduce water quality, funding of perpetual monitoring of creek hydrology, as recommended in the DEIR (4.11-13), should be instituted as well as an annual benthic macroinvertebrate (BMI) sampling program. DCC recommends the use of in-stream loggers for continuous monitoring of depth (flow), NTU turbidity, specific conductance, temperature dissolved oxygen and pH.

Appendix O (Hydrology Evaluation)
Reportedly Clover Valley Lakes, with a density of houses (558 units), is estimated to increase in Clover Valley Creek's peak flow by approximately 25 percent during storm events. Flooding due to these additional flows was not addressed at Midas Avenue. A

26-18

storm in December, 2005 caused Clover Valley Park to flood and Sunset Whitney at Midas Avenue to turn into a virtual lake. PCWA has warned of potential storm water runoff and overflow from Whitney Reservoir (4.11-11) which will add 10cfs into Clover Valley Creek. Volume of unmitigated and mitigated flows at down stream locations, such as Midas Avenue, etc., during 10- year and 100-year storms should be estimated and impacts addressed.

Letter26 cont'd

26-19

The temporary levee system would have to meet stringent construction standards, to avoid catastrophic failure, and may require special permitting for dams. Currently accepted standards suggest construction of off-channel basins would avoid problems associated with interrupting the natural stream sediment flow, such as incising and bank erosion. If off-stream detention can not be constructed within the confines of this narrow valley location, then the scale of the project should be reduced.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR for this project. We appreciate your concern for health of our community including natural, economic, and social components.

Sincerely,

Gregory Bates
Executive Director

LETTER 26: DRY CREEK CONSERVANCY

Response to Comment 26-1

The comment does not address the adequacy of the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 26-2

See Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 26-3

Mitigation Measure 4.11MM-1(a), on page 4.11-13 of the RDEIR, is not a recommendation, but required mitigation. As such, the project applicant would be legally obligated to hire a qualified consultant to perform the water quality monitoring in accordance with standards set by the City and by the Dry Creek Council, to monitor the hydrology of Clover Valley Creek in perpetuity. Please refer to Mitigation Measure 4.11MM-5(d) (RDEIR pp. 4.11-25 and -26).

Response to Comment 26-4

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 – Land Use.

Response to Comment 26-5

See Section 1 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 26-6 through 26-8

Construction impacts to riparian and wetland habitats are addressed in RDEIR Impact Statement 4.11I-3. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.11MM-3(a) through -3(c). Please refer to pp. 4.11-15 through 4.11-20 in the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 26-9

On page 4.11-24 of the RDEIR, use of vegetated water quality swales is required for flow from the outlet of the Stormwater 360 StormFilter treatment systems to Clover Valley Creek. Grassy swales were also identified to provide treatment of the runoff from the commercial area parking lots (RDEIR, pg 4.11-24). Also, vegetated buffer strips, which are similar to grassy swales, were identified for use along some of the roadways (RDEIR, pg 4.11-25); however, along many of the roadways the steep grades would prevent use of swales or buffer strips. Alternative BMPs need to be used in these areas. Also see Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 26-10

The commenter questions the validity of the National Marine Fisheries Service ("NMFS") 2002 Biological Opinion ("BO") because NMFS in 2005 issued an updated critical habitat designation that the Commenter believes includes Clover Valley Creek.

The BO[1] is not invalidated by NMFS's September 2005 designation of critical habitat. An examination of the coordinates included with the 2005 NMFS designation reveals the reach of Clover Valley Creek at the project site is not designated critical habitat. This conforms to the fact that impediments downstream of the project site likely prevent migration of anadromous species.

Even assuming the 2005 critical habitat designation included Clover Valley Creek, this fact would not invalidate the BO. The BO was developed during a time in which Clover Valley Creek was designated critical habitat. NMFS designated critical habitat for Central Valley Spring Run Chinook and Central Valley Steelhead in February 2000 that included the Sacramento River and all river reaches accessible to the listed species. (65 Fed. Reg. 7778, 7779 (February 16, 2000)) The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") initiated formal consultation with NMFS for the Clover Valley project in October 2001. On April 30, 2002, a legal challenge to the process of designating critical habitat resulted in a district court vacating the critical habitat designations for nineteen salmon and steelhead species including Central Valley Chinook and Central Valley Steelhead (National Home Builders v. Evans (D.D.C. 2002)). Notwithstanding the withdrawal of the critical habitat designation, the project applicant and the Corps chose to complete the NMFS consultation on the basis that the project "may affect" anadromous species. Thus, the BO was developed as if Clover Valley Creek were in fact critical habitat even though it was issued October 22, 2002, after the court vacated the critical habitat designation. Consequently, even if the portion of Clover Valley Creek at the project site were considered critical habitat (which it is not) the BO would not be invalidated by a subsequent reinstatement of critical habitat because it was already developed to analyze the impact and make recommendations as if the Creek were critical habitat. The BO's conclusion that the project would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of Central Valley steelhead remains valid. Further, the City will require Mitigation Measure 4.8MM-15(a) whereby the terms and conditions outlined in the BO shall be implemented.

The Commenter refers to a document reporting occurrences of Salmon in the lower reaches of Clover Valley in the 1960's. (Streams of Western Placer County - Literature Review, 3/3/04) Findings within this document are consistent with conclusions reached by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG"). In a May 9, 2002, letter

[1] The EIR at page 4.8-13 refers to the NMFS Biological Opinion as having been issued May 9, 2002. That date is not correct. The NMFS BO was issued October 22, 2002. The May date refers to a letter from the California Department of Fish and Game in which Dr. Eng notes there are no records indicating salmonids use Clover Valley Creek at the project site and that culverts downstream of the project site potentially prohibit migratory salmonid upstream migration.

CDFG acknowledged the existence of records indicating Clover Valley Creek was used by migratory salmonids downstream of the project site. Specifically, Chinook salmon carcasses were recovered in 1963 below the Sunset-Whitney Golf Course, which is below the project site. Notwithstanding the possible downstream presence of salmon in 1963, the CDFG letter stated that there were no records indicating salmonids used Clover Valley Creek at the project site. CDFG further reported Department staff visited the site on April 23, 2002, and found impediments near the golf course that would potentially prohibit upstream migration. These impediments were installed after the reported downstream occurrences of salmonids in Clover Valley Creek. Thus the potential occurrence of salmonids in the lower reaches of Clover Valley Creek in 1963 does not mean the fish had overcome existing stream impediments. Spawning salmonids using Clover Valley Creek in the 1963 would be deceased by now. After installation of the impediments salmonids would find it impossible to return to Clover Valley Creek because of later-installed impediments. Thus, because salmonids are migratory and do not spend their life cycle in streams like Clover Valley Creek, the in-stream impediments ensure the absence of salmonids subsequent to installation of the impediments. Notwithstanding the improbability of salmonids successfully negotiating the various impediments, the City is requiring Mitigation Measure 4.8MM-15(a) that calls for bottomless culverts at road crossings to span the active channel of the creek in accordance with guidelines recommended by the October 22, 2002 NMFS Biological Opinion. If salmonids were to bypass the in-stream impediments, the project as planned creates no additional barriers to upstream migration.

Response to Comment 26-11

Long-term operational impacts to aquatic habitats associated with the development along Clover Valley Creek as a result of the proposed projects is addressed in Impact 4.8I-8 of the RDEIR. The mitigation measure for this impact includes the implementation of BMPs and the approval of a SWPPP, which would mitigate impacts to water quality and vegetation to a less-than-significant level. The biological study performed by ECORP Consulting Inc., determined that the mitigation measures outlined in the RDEIR would reduce the long-term operational impacts to the aquatic habitat, but not to a less-than-significant level. The project applicant would be required to maintain all proposed stormwater detention areas in perpetuity. Please refer to Mitigation Measures 4.11MM-1(a) and 4.11MM-6 in the RDEIR. As to removal of current barriers to fish migration, the project does not have an obligation, nor control, of the removal of off-site pre-existing fish barriers. Removal of pre-existing fish barriers will not mitigate any impact of development of the project.

Response to Comment 26-12

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 – Land Use.

Response to Comment 26-13

The project proposes to use elevated bridge crossings with bottomless arches that encompass the width of the active creek channel. (See 4.8MM-15(a)) The stream course, during normal flow, will not reach both sides of the natural bottomless span, thereby leaving a portion of the spanned active creek channel dry, allowing passage of wildlife.

In addition, the chances that the construction of the bridges would noticeably affect subsurface flows into the creek are low. In any event, Clover Valley Creek in the vicinity of the Project does not provide suitable habitat for salmonids during the summer and fall, due to the low flows, warm water temperatures, unsuitable substrate types, and the lack of deep pools.

Further, because culvert arches do not have a manufactured bottom they will not have an effect on groundwater supply to the Creek. Commenter's opinion concerning the aesthetic impact of the crossings is noted and will be taken into consideration during the final design phase of the project.

Response to Comment 26-14

See Sections 2, 3 and 4 of Master Response 8 – Biology. When oak trees are planted as part of a mitigation measure, the City does require a monitoring program to ensure the trees are established.

Response to Comment 26-15

Based on the proposed grading plans there will be a minimal amount of area that will flow over the ridges from the lots. Irrigation runoff from these ridgeline lots is not anticipated to create any significant impact to the oak trees along the slope between the ridges and valley floor. The City Engineer has considerable experience in determining the adequacy of improvement plans for hillside development over Mehrten formation, since those particular circumstances occur in numerous locations throughout the City. There have been some instances of groundwater seepage, but no known instances of artificial recharge and seepage due to installed irrigation systems. There is no evidence to indicate such a problem would occur in this Project. Adequate drainage of developed areas is specifically designed in the final improvement plans design and those plans are reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

Response to Comment 26-16

See Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 26-17

See Response to Comment 26-11 and Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 26-18

As noted in RDEIR Impact Statements 4.11I-1 and 4.11I-2 (pp. 4.11-9 through -15), the proposed project's on-site stormwater detention system would actually reduce existing peak stormwater flows from the project site. The peak flows at downstream locations were modeled and are summarized in Table 4.11-2 on page 4.11-12 of the RDEIR. The FEMA Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) issued for the proposed project found that the project would not result in any adverse change to flood stage downstream from the project site. Although the CLOMR is currently inconsistent with the project as proposed, primarily because one roadway crossing has been eliminated, the final (updated) LOMR would ensure that the risk of downstream flooding remains less-than-significant. Please refer to Mitigation Measures 4.11MM-1(a) through -1(c) in the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 26-19

Please see Response to Comment 26-11.

Letter 27

JARVIS FAY & DOPORTO, LLP

475 14th Street #260
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 238-1400
Fax: (510) 238-1404
www.jarvisfay.com

RECEIVED
MAR 15 2006

March 15, 2006

Via E-Mail and Facsimile

Sherri Abbas, AICP
Planning Services Manager
3970 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

replace prior letter (3/6 fax) with this one

RE: Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentativ
Recirculated Draft EIR

Dear Sherri:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps and related approvals. I submit this letter on behalf of the Clover Valley Partners, the proponents of this project.

27-1

We wish to congratulate the City and its consultants in doing such a thorough job preparing the EIR. We believe that the EIR fully complies with CEQA. The purpose of this letter is to request a minor change to the document, and to provide the City and the public with information regarding the benefits of the project and the infeasibility of further reducing the number of units to be developed. We also comment herein on the scope of the EIR.

Requested addition to identified project objectives/analysis regarding infeasibility of alternatives

The one change which we are requesting is to modify the list of project objectives on page 3-11 to add the following additional objectives:

27-2

- "Implement the 1998 development agreement by permitting a development project reasonably consistent with its terms."
- "Provide a well-designed project that is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) preferred blueprint scenario for 2050 and the associated Growth Principles, particularly the principles regarding transportation choices, use of existing assets, and natural resources conservation."