

**Letter 123  
cont'd  
Section II**

7

**SECTION TWO—Discrepancies Between the NOP and the DEIR**

- 123-20      NOP, page 2. Under Local Setting, the reader is advised that the site can be located by Placer County Assessor Parcel Numbers:..." which is followed by a list of 13 parcel numbers. However, when entered into the Placer County Assessor's data base, located in Auburn, California, most of the parcel numbers do not match any given parcel. It is assumed the numbers have been changed; however, the parcel numbers listed were useless for research purposes, as stated.
- 123-21      NOP page 5. It is stated, "The EIR will also include an analysis of a potential on-site sewer alternative. This alternative does not exist or cannot be found in the DEIR.
- 123-22      NOP A. LAND USE. Although many items are mentioned to be addressed in this chapter, along with identification of land use impacts and MM, only three impacts are addressed: Consistency with the General Plan, Construction impacts, and Disclosure to the buyers.  
It is stated that a number of specific concerns (which are listed that were raised during the review of the 2002 DEIR) also will be addressed.  
Are the lots in Clover Valley Woods all one acre as stated? Where is the compatibility with the lot size in this section addressed?  
Where is the "consistency of off-site improvements with the goals and policies stated within the City of Rocklin General Plan" addressed?  
Where are the "Regional and Cumulative" land use inconsistencies/incompatibilities addressed?
- 123-23      NOP B. AESTHETICS. Although aesthetics issues are listed to be addressed, many are not.  
The "scenic vistas" appear to be addressed only off site from the Loomis Basin, or east, side. However, no mention is made, nor MM discussed with regard to on-site scenic vistas, which include but are not limited to snow-capped Sierra Nevada views, Loomis Basin, Sutter Buttes, Sacramento skyline, Coast Range.  
From the bulleted list:  
Where is the discussion of the "removal of the stone walls existing on the site"?  
Although "Lighting standards and requirements" is discussed solely for the commercial development, why is there no discussion for residential requirements?  
Grading is discussed in terms of millions of cubic yards, but not from an aesthetic concern of grading 309 acres out of 622 acres. How significant will that aesthetic impact be?  
Although there is cursory mention of creek road crossing with "shall be bridged, or culverts with masonry creek walls shall be used... Culvert walls shall be designed to appear as bridges;" where is the stated discussion of the visual impact of culverts instead of bridges, and rock fascia instead of masonry?
- 123-24      NOP C. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION.  
It is stated that six scenarios—four quantitatively and two qualitatively will be analyzed. Where are these six?

**Letter 123  
cont'd**

8

123-24  
cont'd

↑ The last bullet states that the traffic study will include an evaluation of traffic calming measures. Where are these calming measures mentioned and/or evaluated?

123-25

NOP D. AIR QUALITY.  
Other than a one-sentence reference to Western Placer County's classification as a "server" non-attainment area for both federal and state standards (page 4.5-4), where is the non-attainment issues addressed (as indicated in the bulleted list)?  
The third bulleted item indicates the DEIR will contain a discussion of the unique topographical setting of the project site and the resulting air quality implications. Other than a one-sentence winter-evening specific narrative on page 4.5-13 ("steep walls...restrict transport and dilution of pollutants.") where are discussions of the unique topographical setting and its relationship to air quality impacts?  
Although monitoring is mentioned on page 4.5-11, it is stated that it is only for inactive areas and "should provide weekly monitoring for wind erosion control. How does this satisfy the NOP stated intention to discuss "mitigation monitoring techniques and enforcement"?"

123-26

NOP E. NOISE.  
Where are the unique sound characteristics of Clover Valley discussed?

123-27

NOP F. CULTURAL RESOURCES.  
Although it is stated that "stone walls, grinding stone areas..." will be discussed, the stone walls are not discussed at all in this section. They are mentioned in a narration, dismissed erroneously as out of sight, out of mind in 4.3-1-9 in the Aesthetics section, but not discussed or analyzed in their historical/cultural context. They are dismissed in the aesthetics section as not being designated for protection by state, county, or municipal policy, but there is no discussion of their relationship to the region's history.  
The grinding stone areas are mentioned possibly once or twice ("Ground Stone" is referenced in Table 4.7-2, but the estimated more than 350 bedrock mortars distributed throughout the project area are not mentioned. How can this satisfy the NOP statement of addressing the issues?  
It is stated that the standard guidelines developed by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) will be adopted. However, other than a single reference in the Reference Section of C. Bruce Hanson, Paleontological Resources, the guideline document is not indicated. Which SVP guidelines were adopted and with which impacts?  
Although there is discussion of Section 106 process, where is the discussion of the stated "...project's participation in the process"?"

123-28

NOP G. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.  
It is stated that this section will include an identification of monitoring strategies. Monitoring plans are mentioned and some described adequately. However, monitoring plans are often included in MM and described in context of "shall be developed," and "shall coordinate...in developing..." and "shall be arranged," but are not fully described. The monitoring strategies are either non existent and/or are not revealed with enough detail for the public to review or assess their relevance, adequacy or appropriateness. As  
↓

**Letter 123** 9  
**cont'd**

123-28  
cont'd

an example, one particular monitoring plan is mentioned as a MM and is described as more of a record keeping activity with no details as to what will be recorded, its relevance, consequences, etc. (MM 4.8 I-7).

Although it is mentioned that the potential effects of the proposed project on wetlands will be discussed in this section, there is little to no discussion of impacts to the seasonal wetlands.

It is stated that potential impacts to wildlife migration and corridors will be addressed, however, with the exception of possible bird references, there is little to no reference to migration and corridors for wildlife—especially with regard to coyotes, deer, turkey, or occasional mountain lion to mention just a few.

The NOP states that the incense cedar will be addressed; however, reference to, or discussion of, the incense cedar has not been found in the DEIR.

The location of the recreations areas, relative to riparian habitat areas, was to be addressed in this section, but we did not find any adequate discussion of any recreational area or its potential impacts. Due to the potential for significant impacts of recreational areas, this is a significant lapse and defect of this DEIR.

NOP H. GEOLOGY

123-29

The NOP states on page 9 that a number of items are to be addressed. Included in the list is: "Location of soil stockpiles in relation to environmentally sensitive areas, such as creeks." The DEIR does not address stockpiles, except to mention, on page 4.9-11, MM1(f), "Prior to approval of improvement plans a plan for the storage of excess fill materials shall be submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. The plan shall identify measures to prevent erosion of the stockpiled soil." On page 4.9-17, the stockpiles are mentioned again, but no location is given; however, the stockpile is designated as potentially significant.

We are not told where the stockpiles will be located (as stated in the NOP), whether they will be near sensitive areas or not, and we are told another plan for the plan will have to be approved. How can we review this impact without this information? Please provide what the NOP promised: location of the stockpiles so that we may adequately assess their impacts and the MM.

From the list provided on page 6, there is no discussion of the timelines and standards for re-vegetation. Page 4.3-20 of the DEIR states "Timing and standards of revegetation shall be at the discretion of the City. Revegetation plans shall be submitted with grading plans. No timeline is specified. With half the 622 acres being mass graded and build out predicted to take 5 to 7 years, the revegetation issues must be fully disclosed.

NOP J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

123-30

The NOP states on page 10 that among the potential contaminant issues to be discussed are fertilized lawns (E.Coli). This issue was not discussed. When one considers the impact of 558 lawns all applying easily over 5 to 10 pounds of fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides per year (or per season), this impact needs to be analyzed and appropriate MM.

**Letter 123** 10  
**cont'd**

Although this is a lengthy submission, we did not have enough time to finish our review. Because of our and numerous others' grave concerns about the adequacy of this DEIR in light of the significant impacts, we ask that this Recirculated DEIR be amended to address all the concerns and recirculated for public review before any further action is taken on a Final EIR for the proposed project. With all the time involved in preparing and commenting on a DEIR, it is insignificant and miniscule when compared to the permanent future of Clover Valley.

In closing, to a disturbing extent, many of the MM throughout the entire DEIR are merely plans to plan or plans to plan a program or other non-specific nebulous and vague references to something that may or may not happen. In other words, the plans have not been developed; the MM are inadequate; and/or the project has been submitted prematurely for review. It appears that the City and/or the developer are desperate to expedite this project, even if that means short circuiting the environmental review that ultimately safeguards citizens and protects the environment.

CEQA requires specific measurable action that will mitigate an impact, and we, the public have vested rights to review those measures and the data that supports them. Without sufficient information, these rights to review in a meaningful manner are denied, yet impacts are routinely declared to have been mitigated to less than significant. **Please re-examine all MM and require specific action for the public to review along with the data to support the MM.**

Finally, because Rocklin does not need a reputation as the city that destroyed Clover Valley, the most pristine and ecologically sensitive area in possibly all of south Placer County, the Alternative of No Project is best. From an economic standpoint, Rocklin will reap more from a preserve or conservatory with tourist dollars than from 558 residential units. I urge the City of Rocklin to extend its vision of the new downtown area to include a new vision for Clover Valley.

Sincerely,



Marilyn Jasper  
3921 Dawn Dr.  
Loomis, CA 95650

123-31

**LETTER 123: JASPER, MARILYN**

**Response to Comment 123-1**

The City recognizes the direction provided by CEQA Guidelines section 15141 that the text of draft EIRs normally should be less than 150 pages, or less than 300 pages for projects of unusual scope or complexity. The commentor is correct that the RDEIR well exceeds the recommended 300-page limit, assuming the present project can be considered to be of unusual scope or complexity. However, it is simply not possible to address all of the issues required under the CEQA statute and Guidelines, as they have been interpreted by the courts, for this project, within the 300 page limit. This point is further illustrated by the extensive comments received on the RDEIR, and the numerous requests for additional information and analysis contained therein.

**Response to Comment 123-2**

The comment does not outline any specific instances or examples from the DEIR; therefore the response can only be formulated in general terms. The DEIR is based largely upon tentative maps and plans that have not yet been finalized. All of these programs referred to by the commentor would be reviewed upon approval of the final maps for the proposed project. The mitigation measures include performance guidelines for the proposed project. The final map approval process will ensure that the proposed project meets the performance guidelines set forth in the DEIR mitigation measures. Therefore, the commentor's concern regarding the necessity of the availability of complete plans is not pertinent in regard to the EIR process. The primary concern is if the design and performance guidelines set forth the mitigation measures would be adequate.

**Response to Comment 123-3**

The Development Agreement and associated Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts were approved with little public comment on November 25, 1997. No immunity was granted from oak tree mitigation, rather a project specific mitigation measure for loss of oak trees was adopted in recognition of the unique character of Clover Valley and the desire to preserve large areas of the oak woodland. See Section 2 of Master Response 8 - Biological Resources.

**Response to Comment 123-4**

Close proximity to transportation corridors is in reference to nearby arterials such as Sierra College Boulevard, which offer direct access to major transportation corridors such as Interstate 80.

**Response to Comment 123-5**

CEQA generally does not require EIRs to include economic analyses of projects (except to the limited extent that a project may have economic impacts which result in secondary

physical impacts on the community, which is not the case here). In acting upon the project and in considering the feasibility of mitigation measures and alternatives, the City Council may consider and make findings regarding economic feasibility, based upon information provided in the record, including evidence outside the EIR relating to non-environmental factors.

In any event, the history of the project site as summarized in this comment is not complete. It is significant to note that the City Council approved the project site for a greater level of development than is now proposed, when it approved annexation and zoning of the site for development in the mid-1990's, and when it approved the Development Agreement in 1998. The applicant contends that, in reliance upon these approvals, it has incurred significant expenses since that time.

See also Response to Comment 27-2.

### **Response to Comment 123-6**

The management plans will be reviewed by a cadre of professional agency archeologists who will ensure the adequacy of the plans for the resources. Disclosure of site contents, even without location information, may encourage vandalism or looting of resources. (See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources) Orange fencing will not reveal the location of cultural resources because it is used for protecting oak trees, river corridors and preventing accidental incursion into potentially dangerous topography. Thus, it will not be obvious which fencing is being used to protect sensitive cultural resources.

### **Response to Comment 123-7**

The commentor's information regarding the number of sites to be impacted is incorrect. The City and the Developer have redesigned the site a number of times so that earlier site plans are outdated. For sites impacted by construction, Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources explains that mitigation will be developed by means of the federal NHPA Section 106 process. Data recovery excavations will occur at an appropriate time; this is covered in the management plans. Tribes on NAHC's contact list will be contacted pursuant to SB 18 and given an opportunity to comment on the proposed project.

### **Response to Comment 123-8**

The proposed project does not include the destruction of 28 sites; management will be covered in the management plans, see Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources. Standards of significance for impacts to cultural resources were developed pursuant to CEQA and are reported at RDEIR 4.7-28. The RDEIR does not report just one "data-recovery-timing" impact as the commentor states. Rather, the RDEIR explains that mitigation through the federal process will be developed for sites that are impacted by construction. Commentor recommends avoidance as a mitigation measure. The RDEIR notes at 4.7-33 that the project has been revised a number of times to avoid cultural resources. One component of the mitigation that the NHPA Section 106 process requires will be data recovery by excavation

prior to construction. Data recovery by excavation before construction addresses the concerns raised by the commentor, namely, that construction will result in a lost opportunity“ to gather information that could unlock many archaeological mysteries.”

**Response to Comment 123-9**

See Master Response 7.

**Response to Comment 123-10**

See Master Response 7.

**Response to Comment 123-11**

The October 22, 2002 NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinion concerning the Clover Valley project is a public document and may be requested by calling NOAA Fisheries or visiting the agency’s website.

**Response to Comment 123-12**

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 - Land Use

**Response to Comment 123-13**

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 - Land Use.

The commenter’s suggested alternative would not be economically feasible; infrastructure such as a museum, non-invasive trails and cultural/nature interpretive centers would require substantial funding. For more information regarding the infeasibility of this alternative please see the “open Space With Some Public/Quasi-Public Uses” section on page 6-5 of the Alternatives chapter of the DEIR. Several alternatives are included in the EIR, including a reduced buildout alternative. These alternatives are discussed in the Alternatives Chapter 6 of the EIR.

**Response to Comment 123-14**

See response to comment 123-13.

**Response to Comment 123-15**

Low Impact Development (LID) principals for hydrological and stormwater management are not included in the adopted goals and policies of the City of Rocklin. The City of Rocklin’s General Plan and design guidelines include a number of goals and policies pertaining to best management practices (BMPs) similar to the LID principals. The proposed project would be required to abide by adopted goals, policies and best

management practices supported by the City of Rocklin as well as applicable state and federal guidelines.

#### **Response to Comment 123-16**

The commenter's claim that the Clover Valley area would be "probably rated by archeologists as one of the richest in the country" is unsubstantiated and highly speculative. The standards of significance applicable when analyzing the cultural and paleontological resources are included on page 4.7-28 of the DEIR. While impacts to cultural resources were found to be potentially significant, a number of mitigation measures outlined in impact discussion 4.7I-1 were included that would mitigate these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **Response to Comment 123-17**

The commentator is incorrect in suggesting that there will be bare areas of graded soil following the initial mass grading of the entire site. The City of Rocklin requires that all grading be hydro seeded prior to the rainy season. Any grading that has been completed during the dry season will be hydro seeded with an approved seed mixture prior to rains and erosion possibilities. See also Response to Comment 43-187

#### **Response to Comment 123-18**

The project needs to be graded such that the connection from Park Drive to Sierra College Boulevard can be constructed first. In order to construct this connection, all grading to the north of this will need to be completed, as well as the gravity sewer mains that connect into Rawhide Road to the south. Due to these constraints of the project and the balancing of earthwork throughout, this project needs to be graded at one time. See also Response to Comments 43-187, 123-17.

#### **Response to Comment 123-19**

The commentator's opinion is noted. See Response to Comments 123-17 and 123-18

#### **Response to Comment 123-20**

Information related to each of the Placer County Assessor Parcel Numbers included on page 2 of the NOP and on page 3-1 of the Project Description chapter in the DEIR is readily available through the Placer County online Property Assessment search system which can be found at: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/assessor/assessment-inquiryiframe.htm>T.

#### **Response to Comment 123-21**

In response to the NOP, the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) submitted a comment letter dated September 15, 2005, stating that it "will not consider for approval



the potential on-site sewer alternative.” Based upon this feedback from the public agency responsible for providing sewer service to the project, the RDEIR did not include an on-site sewer alternative.

### **Response to Comment 123-22**

The comment introduces three points of discussion that are listed in the NOP (page 5-6) as topics that would be addressed in the DEIR.

1. As discussed on the paragraph beginning on the bottom of page 4.2-10 and continuing on 4.2-11 of the Land Use chapter of the DEIR, the land uses of the proposed project were found to be compatible with the adjacent land uses. The lot size of the proposed project ranges from approximately 0.16 acres to 1.2 acres and were found to be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Policies 6, 7, and 9.

Though the DEIR does not specifically discuss the proposed project’s compatibility with the neighboring Clover Valley Woods project area, based upon the above-cited text, the DEIR concluded that the proposed project was consistent with the General Plan policies and with the adjacent land uses.

2. Issues related to the proposed project’s consistency with the General Plan for both off-site and on-site uses is addressed in Impact 4.2I-2. The DEIR found impacts associated with the proposed project’s consistency with the General Plan for both on- and off-site improvements to be less-than-significant.
3. As noted in the final paragraph of page 4.2-15 of the DEIR, the land use impact analyses includes discussions of the existing and planned land uses in the project area. The cumulative land use impacts would not differ from those identified for the proposed projects. Cumulative impacts associated with actual physical impacts of the proposed projects (e.g. visual, water quality, biological, etc.) are addressed in later chapters of this Draft EIR.

### **Response to Comment 123-23**

The commenter expresses concern regarding the loss of scenic vistas on the proposed project site and states that “on-site scenic vistas” include views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, Loomis Basin, Sutter Buttes, the Sacramento Skyline and the Coastal Range. CEQA’s environmental analysis of scenic vistas pertains to impacts to existing sensitive receptors, such as views from the Loomis Basin, which would be impacted by the development of the proposed project. The proposed project site is vacant and inaccessible to the public; therefore, views from the valley were not analyzed. As stated by the commenter, the DEIR did discuss impacts related to development upon the ridgelines to the east of the Clover Valley development. See Master Response 3 – Aesthetics.

Removal of the stone walls existing on the proposed project site is discussed in Impact 4.3I-9. These impacts were found to be less-than-significant. See Section 3 of Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources

Impacts related to lighting standards and impacts for both commercial and residential land uses is discussed in Impact 4.3I-10. These impacts were found to be less-than-significant after the implementation of suggested mitigation measures.

Aesthetic impacts as a result of grading on the project site are discussed in Impact 4.3I-1. These impacts were found to be less-than-significant after the implementation of suggested mitigation measures.

Visual impacts related to creek crossings are included in Impact 4.3I-7. The discussion finds the impact to be potentially significant. Mitigation measures included would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

#### **Response to Comment 123-24**

The discussion of the existing conditions on the proposed project site begins on page 4.4-1 of the DEIR. This discussion includes Table 4.4-2, “Existing P.M. Peak Commuter Hour Intersection Operating Conditions” and Figure 4.4-4, “Existing Daily Traffic Volumes,” which illustrate the current conditions.

The existing plus project scenario is included in Impact 4.4I-1 (see Figure 4.4-5 for the Estimated Project Trip Distribution).

The Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project conditions are discussed in Impact 4.4I-5. This cumulative study includes qualitative analysis of the long-term forecast for the total buildout of the City of Rocklin for both the no project and plus project conditions.

The analysis of traffic calming measures is included throughout the analysis of the proposed project’s impacts to circulation. The traffic analysis takes into account all design features of the proposed project, which include those designed to help ease traffic levels.

#### **Response to Comment 123-25**

In addition to the brief mention of the non-attainment issues in Western Placer County on page 4.5-4, the Environmental Protection Agency section, which begins on the bottom of page 4.5-5 of the DEIR, includes a more in-depth discussion of air quality standards in regard to the existing setting.

The primary unique topographical trait of Clover Valley is that the valley walls are, in places, steep and could restrict the transport and dilution of pollutants. The description

included on page 4.5-13, though succinct, is correct in identifying the most pertinent relevant topographical trait of the project site in regard to air quality.

The Air Quality chapter of the DEIR includes a discussion of a number of different mitigation monitoring techniques, which would be enforced by the City and other agencies. These include a Dust Control Plan (see mitigation 4.5MM-1[a]). The dust control plan would require the approval of the City Engineer as well as the Placer County Air Pollution Control District and would require a number of dust and air quality controls at the expense of the developer. The Wind Erosion Control program noted by the commenter is an element of the Dust Control Plan.

### **Response to Comment 123-26**

The discussion of the existing setting in the Noise Chapter of the DEIR takes into account the unique sound characteristics of Clover Valley as an innate element of the analysis. Specifically, the discussion of the existing setting which begins on page 4.6-4 of the DEIR discusses how roadway noise along Sierra College Boulevard is naturally mitigated by existing hills as well as other features which affect railway and roadway noise.

### **Response to Comment 123-27**

As noted by the commenter, the discussion of the on-site stone walls included in Impact 4.3I-9 states that the stone walls are not recognized as protected historic resources. The cultural resources study conducted by Peak & Associates determined that the walls were nonunique archaeological resources. Peak's conclusion was confirmed by a second study conducted by archaeological consulting firm SWCA (See Appendix A, *Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the Proposed Clover Valley Project, Rocklin*, SWCA Environmental Consultants, June 16, 2006). Public Resources Code § 21083.2(a) states: "An environmental impact report, if otherwise necessary, shall not address the issue of nonunique archaeological resources." For this reason, the discussion of the stone walls was included in the Aesthetics chapter rather than the Cultural and Paleontological Resources chapter of the DEIR.

For the sake of clarification, the following shall hereby be added to page 4.7-21 of the Cultural and Paleontological Resources chapter of the EIR.

#### *Volcanic Rock Walls*

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Analysis conducted by Wallace, Kuhl & Associates noted that a personal interview with landowner Bud Taglio and an Archaeology/Cultural Resources report compiled by Foothill Archaeological Services for Clover Valley determined that the rock walls on the project site consist of native volcanic rock and were constructed in the 1880s by Chinese laborers working on a ranch owned by Parker Whitney to help corral sheep. The report estimates that the walls were originally up to five feet in height, the tallest now stands at approximately three feet in height (see page 4 of Appendix M for

more details). The cultural assessment performed by Foothill Archeological Services determined that the remains of the historic stone walls have not been designated for protection by state, county, or municipal policy. Because the rock walls are not considered by be a historic resource, impacts related to the removal of the rock walls is included in the Aesthetics Chapter of the EIR.

This changes is for clarification and does not change the analysis included in the DEIR.

Impacts related to identified archaeological sites in the project area include impacts to identified bedrock mortars and are discussed in Impacts 4.7I-1, 4.7I-3 and 4.7I-4.

The RDEIR concluded that any potential for paleontological impacts will be mitigated to a level of insignificance with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7MM-2(a) through 4.7MM-2(c). No further analysis nor the application of SVP Guidelines was found to be necessary. See RDEIR pages 4.7-34 to 4.7-38.

### **Response to Comment 123-28**

The record keeping activity included in Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 is in reference to the mitigation measure as a whole. The record-keeping contractor would maintain a record of alignments and construction techniques that are outlined in the rest of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7. As stated in the measure, “The contractor shall keep records of the monitoring to be made available to the City Engineering Department for ensuring compliance with the erosion control program.” The purpose of the record is to provide the City with an adequate method of monitoring the implementation of suggested mitigation measures.

Seasonal wetlands are discussed in several places within the Biological Resources chapter; see the Mitigation Measure for Impact 4.8I-7, Impact 4.8I-8, and 4.8I-16. Additionally, see 4.8I-12 and 4.8I-13, which discuss impacts related to animals as a result of the loss of wetland habitat.

Please see Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources for more information regarding habitat fragmentation and migration issues.

The reference to incense cedars in the NOP was in error. They are not a special status species and were not separately evaluated in the RDEIR. However, the RDEIR does consider and mitigate impacts to non-oak trees to the extent that such impacts could effect special-status species using those trees. See the discussion of Impacts 4.8I-10, 4.8I-14.

Impacts related to the placement of recreational areas near riparian habitat are addressed as part of Impact 4.8I-4 in the Biological Resources chapter of the DEIR.

### **Response to Comment 123-29**

See Response to Comment 43-185.

### **Response to Comment 123-30**

Impacts related to the use of household fertilizers are considered within Impact 4.11I-5, which discusses impacts of the proposed project to stormwater quality. Additionally, urban pollutants are further addressed in Mitigation Measure 4.11MM-9(a) which states the following:

Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Best Available Technologies (BATs) be incorporated into project design to reduce urban pollutants in runoff, consistent with goals and standards established under federal and State non-point source discharge regulations (NPDES permit) and Basin Plan water quality objectives.

The implementation of BMPs and BATs for stormwater management, in combination with measures provided for Impact 4.11I-5 were found to reduce potential impacts regarding urban pollutants such as fertilizers to a less-than-significant level. See also Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

### **Response to Comment 123-31**

See Response to Comment 123-2 regarding the role of mitigation measures and the development of plans and programs.

The commenter's opinions regarding the proposed project and alternative land uses for Clover Valley are noted and will be forwarded to the appropriate decision-making bodies.