

Letter 43  
cont'd

43-197  
cont'd

↑ The Placer Mosquito Abatement District 2002 DEIR comment letter (October 14, 2002) raises the issues of placing people in areas where mosquitoes are present and increasing use of pesticides in areas where little was required in the past. **Why aren't these impacts discussed as a part of the DEIR review? Please compare and contrast the hazardous impacts of the mosquitoes AND the hazardous impacts of the spraying if it is suggested as a mitigation measure. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.**

Page 4.10-17, Mitigation Measure 4.10-I-6:

43-198

Although the riparian wetlands and seasonal wetlands are well known to exist in the project area, 4.10 I-6 ignores the standing water that is present year-round on the project site. The impacts discussed are confined to landscaped areas or detention basins, but the riparian and season wetlands should have been analyzed, addressed, and mitigated. **Please provide information for public review and recirculate.**

43-199

It is stated that the proposed detention basins would empty and routine flow rates would return to normal in a 100-year storm event. Two events have proven that this assumption may be faulty.

On December 31, 2005, Clover Valley Creek (along with other parts of Placer County) experienced what has been classified by the Placer County Flood Control Agency a ten-year flood event. The large sediment flows and subsequent re-channeling of the Creek created numerous mosquito-breeding pools with water that easily stood for more than 72 hours. This, followed by a "false spring" (February), obviously increased mosquito populations.

Secondly, in some years, there is not a 72-hour "drying-out" period (March, 2006 for example), where successive major or even minor precipitation events can keep pools in existence for weeks.

**How will sediment flows that create ponds be removed in less than 72 hours, especially in inaccessible creek areas? How will mosquito-breeding pools be eliminated when successive precipitation events will ensure their existence?**

**Spraying for mosquitoes is common practice, and if conducted in the vicinity of Clover Valley Creek, riparian or seasonal wetlands areas, or residential areas, what will the impacts be to all aquatic habitat? How will spraying be attenuated to prevent such significant impacts?**

43-200

MM-6(b) states a plan but does not specify any details or conditions which can be reviewed. **How will the "adequate" funding for maintenance be determined? How will the detention basins be designed to drain with potentially huge sheets of sediment inflows? Without information, the efficacy of these plans cannot be evaluated.**

43-201

↓ The Placer Mosquito Abatement District 2002 DEIR comment letter (October 14, 2002) specifically states that access for District staff will be severely limited. Although the MM states that staff shall be provided access to ditches and detention basins, this implies that treatment will occur in the entire wetlands (or wherever the undefined detention basins exist), small ponds and "puddles" off the creek. Currently some of these areas are blocked from access by blackberry bushes. **How will those areas be accessed? What will the impacts be to aquatic habitat, especially with what we now know**

43-201 **about pyrethrin<sup>2</sup> toxicity in bonding to sediment? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.** Letter 43 cont'd

43-202 As an alternative to the in-stream detention basins with all their negative impacts, consideration should be given to LID ideas and suggestions. One suggestion would be to consider systems that are built into each household, with each residential unit containing all its own impervious-surface generated run off. A holding tank, cistern, or area can be established and maintained to be dissipated at a more opportune time for maximum flood control and healthy creek flows. These systems can also be a part of a reusable water conservation program. **Please analyze viable alternatives to the in-stream detention basin plans, compare advantages and disadvantages, and submit to public for review.**

43-203 Page 4.10-8—Proximity to Union Pacific Rail Lines  
It is stated that due to the natural topographical barrier that the ridgeline provides, that the proposed project is not considered susceptible to explosions or release of hazardous materials. This is simply NOT a truthful statement. An explosion, a potential subsequent fire and/or release of toxic fumes or gasses, would definitely impact the proposed project. Depending upon prevailing breezes, not only would ridgeline units be impacted, but also valley floor units could be impacted.  
**Where are the studies to analyze this very real and significant impact? Why isn't mitigation proposed? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.**

43-204 Sparks from trains and subsequent fires along railroad tracks, although not common occurrences, do happen at a frequency of concern to anyone who lives near a train track. Yet fire hazard from train activity is not mentioned at all. This is a significant hazardous impact, as anyone who lives in dry, hot summer, high-fire danger areas near a railroad track knows well. **Why isn't the potential hazard from railroad-caused fire analyzed? Why isn't mitigation proposed?**

43-205 It is stated that in the event of a derailment, UP Railroad has a type of lining that prevents accidental release of hazardous materials. How does that explain these reported UP's train wrecks: April, 2005 (San Bernardino—Neighborhood evacuated, tank carrying compressed chlorine cracked but did not release contents); October 2005 (Arkansas--Escaping fumes ignited, killing a woman in her home.); June, 2004 (Texas--Breaking open a chlorine tanker; fumes killed a train crewman and two residents.)  
With increased train traffic and hazardous materials, one must conclude that the project's proximity to the tracks presents real, possibly life-threatening impacts.  
**Why are these impacts not addressed? Please analyze not only hazardous impacts but also emergency evacuation plans in the event of a train accident or railroad caused fire. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.**

43-206 Page 4.10, I-1: Presence of pesticide and herbicide residues on project site.  
It is stated that the earliest man-made pesticides used on citrus trees (arsenic compound, lead arsenic, DDT, cyanide gas, etc.) were commonly used in southern

<sup>2</sup> "pyrethrin," "pyrethoid," or any derivative are meant to be interchangeable for purposes of this DEIR comment letter.

Letter 43

cont'd

43-206  
cont'd

California. A deduction is made based on timing of insect migration that hazardous pesticides and herbicides were not used in this area. However, the timeframe deduction seems to rely on anecdotal conversations with neighbors and not based in known records. To assume no residues based on hearsay is unacceptable as a standard to declare that no mitigation is required. Testing and analysis must be conducted to properly determine the presence and extent of residue. What records were studied to conclude the land lay fallow from 1906 to 1920? What tests were performed to conclude that little or no applications of environmentally persistent pesticides exist? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.

43-207

Other Hazardous Impacts.

As stated previously, it is known that pyrethroids lose their "persistence" in water fairly rapidly (from hours to one day). However, once they settle in the system, they bind to molecules found in sediments. From that point, in creeks and streams, they may last a year, and are extremely toxic to invertebrates. The toxicity is then transferred up the food chain to fish, via the invertebrates. The pyrethroids are more toxic than the organophosphates because of how rapidly they bind to nerve cells. According to Dr. Don Weston, Ph.D., Univ of Calif/Berkeley and Robert Holmes, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, in studies conducted in Roseville, California, on Kaseberg, South Branch, and Pleasant Grove Creeks, the highest concentrations of the pyrethroids was near the stormwater discharges. The toxicities were not as high in the agricultural areas. Traditional "traps" will not catch the pyrethroids. The studies indicate that homeowners, especially in landscape applications, create a feasible source of the toxicity that is found in the sediments in creeks. With hazardous materials from households being transported directly into creeks via storm drains, how will this be mitigated (especially when dissolved and/or too small to be caught in filtration systems)? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.

43-208

4.11-Hydrology And Water Quality

Page 4.11-6. Phase II of the CWA is probably one of the strongest, most comprehensive agency program that can have a profound effect on the coffers of the City of Rocklin if compliance is lacking. Yet the DEIR discusses Phase II with a single dismissive sentence, stating that if it isn't in Phase I, it's in Phase II. To not discuss the City's requirements with Phase II and the ramifications for non-compliance is a grave omission. The public must have this information fully exposed and explored in order to be able to review the critical relevance it has to this proposed project. Please provide information as to the application of Phase II requirements to the City, the proposed project, and discuss the potential for non compliance impacts. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.

43-209

Page 4.11-7—We thought it was a typo when it appeared in 4.9-5, but perhaps it is for real. Surely the bulleted list is prohibited, instead of "materials that are not prohibited."

43-210

Page 4.11-9, I-1, In both the DEIR and the WYA letter, it is noted that the storm drain systems consists of relatively small diameter pipes. WYA determined that these drainage systems "appear adequate." We do not believe that something as critical to health and safety issues should be proposed that "appear" adequate. With proper modeling, the drainage systems must be irrefutably adequate.

46

Letter 43  
cont'd

43-211

On page 2, the impervious surface created by the project is estimated to be “about 21%” with an apparent assumption of 130 acres of impervious surfaces deducted from 199 acres of residential lots (roads, rooftops, parking lots, etc.). However, using the figure of 199 acres given for residential lots, including minor roads, plus core roadways, commercial, and fire station, the impervious surface acreage is 251 acres, which computes to 40% of the project potentially being impervious surfaces. Even with an adjustment that assumes an entire residential lot will not be impervious, these residential units will have larger-than-usual impervious surfaces. With swimming pools, patios, driveways, and the exceptionally large footprint of the homes planned for this proposed project, to assume a 35% impervious surface per lot based on rooftops is inadequate given the circumstances. Without justification or explanation, we cannot determine how the 21% figure was computed. **What factual bases support that figure? With such a discrepancy (21% to 40%) a meaningful review cannot be completed. An underestimated impervious surface figure will result in inadequate mitigation. Please provide analysis computations and circulate for public review.**

43-212

The WYA letter also states that the detention basins will detain water for time periods of about 24 hours. The DEIR states that the flow rates contained in the creek would return in approximately 24 hours, but that pools may form and retain water for longer than 72 hours (Vol. I, page 4.10-17). The Hydraulic model results are based on the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan, but we are not privy to what it entailed. Although the footnotes state that modifications were made for the proposed project, we are not informed what those were. We would request that more modeling be conducted, that different models be presented for review. With the significance of the December 31, 2005 storm event and the flooding that occurred at Clover Valley Park, more research must be conducted.

The WYA letter points out that the map used did not indicate what culverts would be installed at creek crossings; that the conceptual sketches of the road crossings were not consistent with the culverts identified; that the 2001 CLOMR modeled five creek crossings but currently only four are planned; that the bridge designs are inconsistent with the CLOMR application; that the hydrologic/hydraulic modeling needs to be revised; that a long-term funding mechanism for operation and maintenance must be established; that the drainage report did not show the locations of the ditches, their design, capacity calculations, or provision for ditch maintenance roads. Reference is made to the potential flooding potential cumulatively exacerbated with the future development of the “northern Clover Valley” properties. In spite of all these concerns, WYA concludes that with mitigation, the cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant. With the devastation we have all seen with recent flooding, we urge the City to error on the side of caution. **Please take the homes along the creek out of harm’s way. Please heed the caution expressed in the WYA letter and require more modeling. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.**

43-213

We request in-depth discussion of (1) capture volume of detention basin, holding capacity, adequacy or lack of, in terms of acre feet; (2) impacts of soluble pollutants into the creek, (3) inlet and outlet design configuration, (4) fish stranding, (5) sediment load impacts, (6) draw down impacts with 30 to 72 hours time frame—water warming on fishery, vector breeding, groundwater contamination, (7) maintenance function and funding (removal of sediment, debris, trash,), vegetation management, regular inspection,

47

Letter 43  
cont'd

- 43-213  
cont'd
- ↑ (8) prehistoric sacred site disturbance, including burial sites, in detention pond areas. Please discuss each of these impacts relating to the loss of the 11+ acres of seasonal wetlands and its conversion to detention basins with resultant impacts. Please recirculate the DEIR for public comment on those impacts.
- 43-214
- Page 4.11-13. Once again, the MM listed under MM-1(a) are plans for plans or plans for programs. These are not actions that we can review for adequacy. We have no way of knowing if these are adequate MM or not. Please require the applicant to be specific, require meaningful MM, and recirculate for public review. We cannot review a plan to plan a program.
- 43-215
- Page 4.11-14. In the discussion of access easements to drainage facilities for maintenance activities, including the ditches that will be located behind houses, how will homeowner fencing and other barriers be addressed? Will the ditches be constructed outside the residential property lines? Maintenance issues concerning domestic animals in yards can make this MM extremely difficult to fulfill. Please address access for ditch cleaning and maintenance to avoid "inaccessible" areas on private property yet provide full implementation of the MM.
- 43-216
- Page 4.11-17. How will Geotextiles and Mats impact wildlife movement? Have studies of impacts of these proposed BMP's on wildlife been conducted? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.
- 43-217
- Page 4.11-19. How will the required hazardous spills notification and concrete washout procedures be enforced? Please require penalties for non-compliance sufficient enough to serve as a deterrent, and start with a minimum penalty of fine and suspension of construction activities on a first offense.
- 43-218
- Page 4.11-21-MM-4. Under CEQA, this is not a MM at all and thus does not reduce the impact to less-than-significant. We are not provided with any information in order to evaluate the three possibilities: a "redesign" of the storm drain systems or storm drain extension system to the creek or an alternative mystery design. In other words, the plans are incomplete. The piped systems may prevent erosion as opposed to an open system on 40% slopes, but how will the energy dissipaters prevent pipe "blow outs"? What are the distances that the drainage pipes will travel down the steep slopes? How will the timing of the piped systems be coordinated with either grading, road or residence construction? As even a lay person can imagine, given the 200 to 300 foot elevations, 40% slopes referenced, and even a 4" drainage pipe, the pressure at the end of the line will be large enough to be possibly dangerous. Please provide calculations of the magnitude of the pressure at the end of the pipe given the size of the pipe, slope, and volume of runoff.
- 43-219
- Page 4.11-21-I-5. The discussion of the Vortech/Vortechs/Stormwater360 is pure speculation ("The specific treatment structures to be used have not yet been determined..."). Although the lofty discussion (from pages 4.11-21 through 25) is interesting, the applicant has NOT decided to utilize the "more expensive" StormFilter units that can remove some of the remaining pollutants. "Can remove" does not equate to "will remove"; "some dissolved pollutants" does not equate to "all pollutants" nor are we provided with data to know what "some" constitutes. Further discussion describes a high velocity concentrated discharge (potentially toxic) headed for the creek, eroding the
- ↓



Letter 43  
cont'd

43-219  
cont'd

↑ valley floor en route. This vital section of the DEIR represents an incomplete, premature speculation of how one of the most critical environmental impacts of this project will be mitigated, yet tells us nothing substantial or comprehensive that we can review and evaluate. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.

43-220

In our good faith attempt to review this DEIR, we are confronted with such statements as, "Stormwater360 can provide inspection and maintenance services for their units or the units could be serviced by City staff or other contractors." (page 4.11-22) We do not know what this service entails, the cost, the viability of the company, the competency/training required, the source of funding to perform this service in perpetuity, etc., yet this is one of the most critical components of the creek pollution issues.

Or "The area around the outfall pipe should be lined with rock...to slow the water down...."

Or "The location would likely not be a natural creek.... The flow path should be designed...."

Or statements that are qualified with "can, could be, should be implanted, could be used, could be performed," etc., which are not enforceable. Based on earlier statements in the DEIR, we must assume that the applicant/DEIR/City considers such terms discretionary and not mandatory. (page 4.8-32) Therefore, for us, the public, to rely on a similar good faith attempt to comply with the intention of CEQA on the part of the applicant/DEIR/City with such wording would be pure foolishness. Thus, we request full and comprehensive data on all the potential water/creek pollution impacts as well as the MM and an opportunity to review them, which is not provided in this DEIR.

43-221

Page 4.11-23. The discussion contains no mandate to utilize any of the BMP's described. As stated, "Many BMPs can reduce....Some that could be appropriate.... Many of these BMPs also help reduce the peak runoff rates from developed areas."

The Water Quality Monitoring discussion continues in this vein--no mandatory actions with words at the end of the first paragraph, "Therefore, water quality monitoring should be implemented." This is followed with "could be used" and "could be performed." This discussion does not provide the public with any data or solid procedure to review and evaluate as to the impact on water quality. Theoretically, as stated, monitoring could be performed, that could determine which would be the best plan that could then be used. This vagueness is then designated as potentially significant, but reduced to less than significant with implementation of a possible system that we know nothing about. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.

43-222

Under MM-5(c), a list of 11 bulleted items are presented, all under the discretionary "could be." These are not meaningful MM.

In the entire discussion, there is no mention of penalties for non-compliance. **Substantial daily fines as well as suspension of work on the entire project on the entire site for non-compliance must be prescribed and rigorously enforced. Please provide strong compliance enforcement/penalty measures.**

43-223

↓ Page 4.11-25, MM-5(d). Water quality monitoring must be more specific and much more frequent than annually.

- 43-223  
cont'd
- ↑
- Although the items included in the list are good, there is a huge range of what is meaningful, in terms toxicity testing. For example, certain pyrethroids, bonded in sediment, are toxic to invertebrates (which in turn is toxic to fish) at 4 parts per billion, but some laboratories only tests until toxins are at 25 parts per billion. A creek that is less than 25 ppb could be declared safe, but its levels may be 10 ppb, and therefore extremely toxic.<sup>3</sup> If the second sentence were changed from “The list of constituents monitored should be consistent ...Dry Creek Council” to “The list of constituents monitored and the testing criteria shall be consistent with and approved by the City and the Dry Creek Watershed Council,” then the MM would be more meaningful.
- The list of water quality elements to be monitored must also include temperature, turbidity, as specified by the Dry Creek Watershed Council. A list could be incomplete, but could be consistent (which is unacceptable). The wording on this MM needs to be expanded and strengthened according to Dry Creek Watershed Council acceptable levels. Please do so.
- 43-224
- Although it is stated that the applicant will fund the annual monitoring, if monitoring is conducted more frequently than annually at a level and range necessary for meaningful analysis and action, the applicant's funding in perpetuity needs to be guaranteed with a bond or other permanent source of funds. This MM must provide monitoring results to be available to the public as well as impose enforceable consequences for monitoring results that are unacceptable—suspension of project, remediation of source of problem, etc. The health and integrity of Clover Valley Creek must be a high priority with mandates to insure such conditions are maintained.
- 43-225
- Page 4.11-31. Although the entire impact (I-9) states that it is to focus on water quality resulting from construction of the off-site sewer line, it seems to meander back to the other creek crossings, and attempt to mitigate wetlands as well. Wherever fencing, whether orange mesh or otherwise, is used to designate corridors to protect a sensitive area, they become obstacles to wildlife and potentially life threatening. Please analyze the wildlife impacts of multiple fenced areas, corridors, and other barriers that will impede the natural range of movement of wildlife. Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.
- 43-226
- 4.11-31, MM-9(d). The NOP states that the analysis and restoration discussion of the off-site creek crossings will be in section J. Hydrology and Water Quality. However, it appears that it is partially to be found in this section instead. The MM states that creek-crossing areas shall be restored, but deals only with replanting of vegetation. We ask that the City require as part of the MM a restoration of creek flows to remove all fish barriers (there are not that many) in Clover Valley Creek to Antelope Creek. This would be a reasonable and feasible MM. Since Clover Valley Creek is going to be impacted, this would be a good time to do away with any fish barricades and restore the possibilities for anadromous fish migrations.
- 43-227
- Page 4.11-33. Cumulative impacts related to degradation of water quality appear to be somewhat dismissed or diminished under a fallacious argument that since other previous developments in the Dry Creek Watershed have decreased the water quality, then this proposed project can contribute to the continued decreased water quality as well.
- ↓

Letter 43  
cont'd

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Donald P. Weston, UC Berkeley, Western Placer Watershed Pyrethroid Study Presentation to Placer County Collaborative Watershed Council Meeting, February 7, 2006.

Letter 43  
cont'd

43-227  
cont'd

The deduction is implied that this impact is then potentially significant. Stormwater discharge regulations are much stricter with implementation of NPDES Phase II requirements; thus previous contributions to decreased water quality will be addressed. This project must analyze the cumulative creek degradation impacts under the Phase II restrictions and not under "well, everyone else is doing it" approach. CEQA requires that impacts to existing conditions be analyzed. The existing condition of Clover Valley Creek in the project area borders on pristine. This is the condition that will be impacted (as well as downstream) that we need information, impact analysis, and meaningful MM. Please provide and recirculate.

43-228

Although we have been informed that previous comments on the 2002 DEIR would not be individually addressed but will be a part of the administrative record, we believe many comments were too compelling to ignore in this DEIR. The inconsistencies described in comment letter 22, November 4, 2002, from Law Office of J. William Yeates, specifically mentions creek crossings that are sized to be simultaneously undersized for the purpose of impounding flood flows, and yet sufficiently large enough to ensure that flood flows and wildlife are not adversely affected. Whichever measure is sacrificed, new alternatives or MM must be proposed.

43-229

Related to this is the discussion of using an existing flood plain as a detention basin and analyzing the obvious sediment loads that will occur in the detention basins with standing water, which will result in less flood plain/detention basin capacity. This will result in greater flooding potential than what now occurs in existing conditions. In other words, Clover Valley's existing flood plain now serves as a defacto flood protection. By increasing impervious surfaces, exacerbating the runoff, and filling the flood plain (proposed detention basins), the current protection will be lost while the runoff is increased—double the trouble.

#### 4.12—Public Services and Utilities

43-230

Page 4.12-5, Recycled Water Use. It is stated that the proposed project, because of its location and lacking infrastructure, does not have the ability to be serviced with recycled water. Since Reclaimed and/or Recycled Water is critical in PCWA's IWRP, why isn't developer-funded infrastructure being required either as a part of the project itself or as mitigation?

Recycled (non potable) water is indicated via signage along Crest Drive. With the proximity of this recycled water to the proposed Clover Valley project, why is "location" given as a reason for not utilizing this important water conservation plan?

43-231

Page 4.12-9, Sewer Extension. It is stated that the SPMUD Master Plan would require upsizing of the existing 8" line south of the project area. This is understandable considering the number of units projected in the proposed Clover Valley project. However, there is also a reference to a 20' sewer easement extending beyond the north west boundary of the project on the small lot tentative subdivision maps, identified as "proposed 20' sewer easement." The stated reason for a 20' sewer easement being extended and stubbed out approximately 400' to the north is for 501 possible units to the north. This is growth inducing, yet it is not analyzed or mitigated. Please rectify this omission—analyze (air quality, traffic, water quality, creek/wildlife impacts) and recirculate for public review.

51



Letter 43  
cont'd

- 43-232 Other than the reference to the few sewer easements, there are no on-site sewer line route designations. We don't know where they will be, how deep, how big, or how gravity will work for the entire system. The proposed units down in the valley at the north end (Deercrest Road, Holly Leaf Court, as well as others, have the potential to be too low in elevation to efficiently use the sewer line with gravity. We cannot analyze the impacts without seeing the sewer line route plans. Where will the lines be placed?
- 43-233 What will the impacts be from pressure on sewage lines carrying effluent from upper elevation/ridge crest units over 200' at 20 to 50% gradients? What safeguards are being implemented to prevent sewer line breakage/leaks from such pressures? Will any residential units be on a septic system or any type of system requiring leach fields? Please provide the information and recirculate the DEIR.
- 43-234 Page 4.12-20, Electrical and Natural Gas  
In addition to aesthetic impacts, overhead lines can create fire and other hazards (as can power poles). Why is there no discussion of underground electrical service throughout the entire project? Why aren't developer-funded underground utility lines being required for this proposed development?
- 43-235 Page 4.12-21, Clean Water Act—NPDES  
With Clover Valley Creek, along with its many drainages, being one of the highest tributaries of the Dry Creek Watershed, the impacts on Clover Valley Creek will be carried downstream and impact the Dry Creek Watershed. The impervious surfaces created in the proposed development, as well as their proximity to the creek, coupled with the significant steepness of the slopes, may all combine to constitute a condition of non-compliance with the NPDES Phase II regulations.  
How are the NPDES Phase II regulations being followed and integrated into the proposed project? What measures will be taken to assure homeowner compliance? What measures will be undertaken to educate the public as well as Clover Valley residents and visitors as to their responsibilities and legal obligations with regard to NPDES II regulations? What monitoring funding will be provided for Clover Valley Creek? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.
- 43-236 Page 4.12-26, Fire Services  
With implementation of "Defensible Space" regulations, Fire Safe plans (county, state, and federal), and the passage of SB1369 (including PRC 4291 and 14CCR2291), the magnitude of the potential oak woodland devastation (removal) is staggering. Part of the requirements of Public Resources Code 4291 is:  
  
Effective January 1, 2005, in wildland areas in California, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law on September 23, 2004, Senate Bill 1369. This bill amended both Public Resources Code (PRC) 4291 and Government Code (GC) 51182 in the following manner:  
Increases the minimum clearance (defensible space) requirement from 30' to 100'.  
Allows insurance companies to require home/building owners to maintain firebreaks greater than 100'.  
If compliance is met out to 30 feet, but not 100 feet, the homeowner will receive a written notice of violation, (similar to a traffic "fix it ticket") with recommendations to reduce the fire hazard. The Board and the Department wish

Letter 43  
cont'd

- 43-236 cont'd ↑ to emphasize an educational and cooperative approach with the public to reduce fire hazards.
- 43-237 Why are there no references to any of these regulations and their subsequent significant impacts that will occur with the implementation of the ordinance? Please provide the analysis, the impacts, and the MM for public review.
- 43-238 Page 4.12-31. Water Supply. It is stated that “However, depending on the timing of the project and because PCWA has a first-come, first-serve policy for serving new customers, the completion of any or all of numerous PCWA planner infrastructure projects may be required before PCWA can provide water service for the build out of the Clover Valley project.” Yet on page 4.12-33 the conclusion states that the impacts related to water supply are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. The conclusion appears to be based on the assumption that the project will be immediately approved. However, the reality is that this project has been delayed for over 9 years and most likely will experience further delays.  
The impact should be changed to significant. In addition, why is there no water conservation measures included such as use of rainwater on site, or low water use landscaping?
- 43-239 Sewer: The developer must be required to pay for all costs associated with the off site sewer line extension including the repaving of all streets impacted.
- 43-240 Page 4.12-36. Reference is made to potential problems with police portable radio transmissions in the proposed Clover Valley project area. Although Mitigation Measure 4.12, M-4 (a) states that “the applicant shall fund” mitigation measures to reduce the impacts, should a new transmitter be constructed, no mention of its impacts are given. Knowing the unusual topography of Clover Valley, why weren’t these studies conducted and included in this DEIR? Please analyze reception ranges now, not later, and determine whether or not reception is adequate or will require a tower. Please provide a description of the transmitter—a tower? a shed? What will be the impacts of it, of its location? Will it cause interference with residential receptions?
- 43-241 Police, emergency and fire personnel: The mitigation measure mentions a fire station but does not specify the funding mechanism that would fund the cost of additional fire personnel. Where is the funding mechanism for additional police, fire, and emergency personnel? A special assessment district should be established to provide funding similar to other recently approved large scale developments. This would be consistent with General Plan Policy 8 of the Public Services and Facilities Element.
- 43-241 Impact 4.12, I-5: Impacts to fire protection. Dedication of an acre of land for a future fire station is mentioned, but the timing of the construction is to be determined later. This could place some homes at unnecessarily high risk(s). It is assumed that the applicant will be relieved of future financial obligation for fire protection. However, in the General Plan, Public Services and Facilities Element, Policy 8 states that “developer participation in providing facilities (including equipment)...Participation could consist of ...payment of fees, and/or construction and dedication of facilities.” Why isn’t the applicant being required to pay for construction of the fire station as well as the
- ↓