

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Planning and Environmental Review (PER) prepared an Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration for the *Blossom Ridge Project* (PLNP2020-00104) that was released November 2, 2022 (State Clearinghouse No. 2022110025) and posted on PER's website for public comment. The written comment period ended December 2, 2022. Several letters and emails were received during the public review period. Additionally, one email was received after the public review period, but has been included in this document.

The majority of written comments received offer suggestions or express preferences related to the proposed development. While the comments may reference common themes regarding traffic, noise, trash, and security from past and proposed events held at the project site, the comments do not speak specifically to the inadequacy of the analysis presented in the environmental document. A number of comments received during the public review process addressed the same topical issue, i.e., CEQA baseline. To avoid repetitiveness in the responses to these comments, three "Topical Responses" have been prepared to address these common concerns. See Topical Responses below. Where applicable, the individual responses provide references to the appropriate topical response. All comment letters will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration.

In conformance with Section 15088(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, written responses were prepared addressing comments received on the environmental document. For ease of review, individual comments addressing separate subjects within each letter are labeled based on the letter's numeric designation and comment number (e.g., the first comment in the first letter is Comment 1-1). The text of the comments has been provided, followed by a response. Note that the preface language (where the text consists of salutations and brief descriptions of the commenting organization) or general observations contained in the letter is often excluded. Comment letters are included in their entirety at the end of this document.

LIST OF WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS - AGENCIES

1. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, December 1, 2022
2. Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), December 1, 2022

LIST OF WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS – RESIDENTS/GENERAL PUBLIC

3. Divine Savior Parish. Edmundo A. Puchi, Chairman of the Campus Development Committee, November 30, 2022
4. Therese Griffmartinelli, November 14, 2022 (email)
5. Mark E. Biddlecomb, November 22, 2022
6. Angie Abegg-Sanchez, December 1, 2022 (email)
7. Mark E. Biddlecomb, February 12, 2023 (email)

TOPICAL RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

TOPICAL RESPONSE 1: CHANGES IN DRAINAGE DESIGN

Commenters noted differences between the proposed drainage plan designs shown at Community Planning and Advisory Committees (CPAC), the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC), and in the IS/MND, which were dated June 2021.

There were a couple iterations of the drainage study based upon changes in lot configuration, comments received on landscaping standards, as well as the technical comments received from the County Department of Water Resources (DWR) throughout the entitlement process. An initial drainage study was submitted to DWR that was dated June 6, 2021. Images and analysis from this drainage study were incorporated into the Initial Study that was released in November. The June 2021 drainage study concluded that CEQA impacts were less than significant.

Between the June 2021 submittal and the revised March 2022 study, one of the lots within the parcel map was reconfigured, and subsequently, the design of the detention basin changed. A revised MND has been prepared pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines due to minor revisions to the project description and to reference and discuss the most recent/approved drainage study (please see pages IS-20 & IS-22 of the revised IS/MND). The current drainage improvement plans can be reflected in Plate IS-9 of the revised IS/MND (page IS-22).

As both drainage designs proposed would have resulted in less than significant impacts, the conclusions of the IS/MND remain the same. The project Staff Report summarizes the Conditions of Approval prepared by DWR for the project.

TOPICAL RESPONSE 2: CEQA ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED DRAINAGE FACILITIES

The IS/MND evaluated the projects impacts to existing drainage patterns, runoff, capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems, and water quality. Each of these topical areas are discussed within the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the IS/MND (pages IS-18 – IS-24).

As mentioned in Topical Response 1, there have been several revisions to the proposed subdivision map as well as drainage improvements. There is a typographical error within the IS/MND circulated for public review, that states the proposed detention basin will be located on the eastern, rather than the western, portion of proposed Lot #1. This error occurred after several changes in lot configuration and numbering; however, this typo does not change the underlying analysis and findings of the drainage study, nor does it change the technical findings made by DWR. The IS/MND typo has been corrected in the revised IS/MND. Additionally, the hydrology section has been updated to reflect the updated drainage study and changes in lot line configurations between Lots 2 & 3 of the tentative map (reference Plate IS-9 of the revised IS/MND; page IS-22).

There have been minor changes in the detention basin shape and to the proposed, on-site watersheds' acreages in the northeastern area of the project; however, the DWR's analysis and assessment of the proposed improvements and drainage study have not changed. The drainage studies have shown that the proposed detention basin would reduce 24-hour event flows for 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year events. The basin design would ensure that runoff from the property matches existing conditions, and therefore, would not result in an increase in surface runoff. The proposed drainage basin would be a publicly-maintained facility. The project is conditioned for a drainage easement to be recorded over the area. Additionally, the project has been conditioned to annex the project to into a community finance district or other entity to fund and conduct ongoing maintenance of the landscape features around the detention basin.

The drainage channels to the east of Filbert Ave are not publicly maintained since they are located on private property and do not have a drainage easement recorded over them.

LETTER 1

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Peter Minkel. Written correspondence dated December 1, 2022.

Preface

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore, our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

Comment 1-1

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

Response 1-1

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-2

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs

one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Response 1-2

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-3

Phase 1 and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

Response 1-3

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-4

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Response 1-4

Comment noted. The project site does not involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands.

Comment 1-5

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Response 1-5

The project site does not involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands. The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-6

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Response 1-6

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-7

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

Response 1-7

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-8

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

Response 1-8

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

Comment 1-9

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

Response 1-9

The Initial Study analyzed construction-related water quality as well as operational, stormwater runoff. The Water Quality discussion begins on page IS-22 and continues through page IS-24.

LETTER 2

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), Kim Crawford, Environmental Services Specialist. Written correspondence dated December 1, 2022.

Comment 2-1

We have no comments to offer at this time but would appreciate if the County of Sacramento would continue to keep SMUD facilities in mind as environmental review [as] the Project moves forward. Please reroute the Project analysis for SMUD's review if there are any changes to the scope of the Project.

Response 2-1

Comment noted. If there are changes to the project that may affect SMUD facilities, the County will reach out to SMUD for comment/coordination.

LETTER 3

Divine Savior Parish. Edmundo A. Puchi, Chairman of the Campus Development Committee, November 30, 2022

Preface

I am writing on behalf of the Divine Savior Parish Community. Our Parish Campus is located immediately to the South of the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision property.

We reiterate our concerns previously submitted to the Orangevale CPAC regarding the purposed re-zoning and proposed subdivision.

Comment 3-1

The proposed density of the subdivision far exceeds the density of the properties along Filbert Ave. The proposed density will result in an increase of traffic that will converge on the intersection of Filbert Ave. and Greenback Lane. The current traffic density causes backlog of traffic at the signal at that intersection. Our Parish campus has experienced significant damage due to vehicles using our parking lot to bypass the traffic light at that location.

Response 3-1

The County Department of Transportation reviewed the project and did not require a traffic study. Transportation and Traffic analyses can be found on pages IS-12 through IS-15 of the IS/MND.

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, it does not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Comment 3-2

We have many activities at our church and church hall in the evenings. For safety purposes, we have lighting in our parking lot all night. We are concerned that the proposed density and close proximity of the parcels immediately north of our property will be considered a nuisance to new owners of the proposed parcels as a result of our lighting systems.

Response 3-2

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, it does not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Comment 3-3

We are concerned that the proposed subdivision will cause potential surface drainage issues for the entire vicinity, particularly on the south boundary of the proposed subdivision, which is immediately adjacent to our church property. The proposed grading plan indicates that the elevation of lots 13, 14, 15 on the southern edge of the proposed subdivision is higher than our church parking lot elevation and only a 6" deep swale is included in the proposed design, while a significant area of these proposed lots will drain to the South. (See Drainage Plan Cross-Section D-D, Preliminary Grading Plan) This will result in significant runoff from the improved properties immediately to the north of the church. As commented on by many adjacent property owners at the Orangevale CPAC hearing, the drainage design for the proposed subdivision is not adequate to prevent flooding of the adjacent properties. The proposed drainage basin in the Northeast corner

of the property, as well as the runoff from the proposed lots and the improved streets will drain into a swale that is across Filbert Ave. This swale is already overburdened by the existing drainage patterns.

Response 3-3

Refer to Topical Response 2.

Comment 3-4

We request that consideration be given to reducing the density in the proposed RD 4 and RD 3 zoning to RD 2. This is more consistent with the adjacent property to the North and West of the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision. Please note that Orangevale properties are rapidly downsizing. This reduces the opportunities for homeowners, present and future, that want to stay in Sacramento County to have small farms or have a few larger farm animals Orangevale is one of the few remaining rural communities where such opportunities are still available. RD-2 or larger lot sizes are more appropriate for this community.

Response 3-4

Discussions related to Land Use and densities are discussed on pages IS-6 through IS-10 of the IS/MND.

The densities associated with the proposed land use designations are similar to nearby, existing land uses and residential development in the area (reference Plate IS-4; page IS-7 of the IS/MND).

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, it does not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Comment 3-5

Finally, we are concerned about the impact of SB 9 on this neighborhood and the continued development of the few agricultural areas that remain in Orangevale.

Response 3-5

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, is not specific to the project, which proposes to divide 9.4 acres into 32 single-family residential lots in the RD-3 and RD-4 zones. The concern will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

EMAIL #1 (COMMENT #4)

Therese Griffmartinelli. Written correspondence (email) dated November 14, 2022

Comment 4-1

Orangevale has for a long time prided itself on 1 acre lots at a minimum. What you were doing to 6331 Filbert is a crime. It is not meant for apartment housing and it's not meant for quarter acre lots. We are already crunched on our roads, water, power, and sewer.

Response 4-1

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, it does not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Apartment housing is not proposed as part of the project; the project proposes to divide 9.4 acres into 32 single-family residential lots in the RD-3 and RD-4 zones. Discussions related to Land Use and densities are discussed on pages IS-6 through IS-10 of the IS/MND. The densities associated with the proposed land use designations are similar to nearby, existing land uses and residential development in the area (reference Plate IS-4; page IS-7 of the IS/MND).

Transportation and Traffic discussions can be found on pages IS-12 – IS-15 of the IS/MND.

Comment 4-2

Adding more property to that acreage with more people and more cars is a stupid and greedy. There is no mass transit to speak of in Orangevale and where are all the children going to go to school.? Filbert is a 2 Lane Rd. at best and at that it's narrow, there's no road work done in Orangevale ever . I believe the developers for this project are committing a crime against the property owners that are nearby, and need to go back to the drawing board.

Response 4-2

The County of Sacramento acknowledges this comment; however, it does not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Transportation and Traffic discussions can be found on pages IS-12 – IS-15 of the IS/MND.

LETTER 5

Mark E. Biddlecomb. Written correspondence dated November 22, 2022.

Preface

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rezoning, general plan amendment, community plan amendment and proposal to subdivide the current 9.4 acre orchard into 32 single family residential lots.

I've no doubt that, from an economic and a highest and best use analysis standpoint, subdividing this historic orchard is the correct and most obvious choice for this parcel. However, there are numerous concerns with the project.

Comment 5-1

First and foremost, the Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration indicates the proposed drainage system detention basin is located on the eastern side of Lot 1. However, that is not the design developed and recommended for implementation to the Orangevale CPAC at their April 19, 2022 meeting, nor is it the design shown in the documents that accompany the Notice of Intent for the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Further, the proposal approved June 2022 by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) and the one being put forth under the Mitigated Negative Declaration are not the same.

The drainage improvements developed and recommended by CNA Engineering, Inc. (CNA) are different than those shown in the DRAC documents. The map in the DRAC documents show a basin on the western portion of Lot 1. However, the map in the Mitigated Neg Dec and the study conducted by CNA show it as being on Lot 2. This would seem to be the appropriate map/study/plan to adopt and implement under the Mitigated Neg Dec, since the drainage study by CNA show it on Lot 2 and is the one developed and recommended by CNA. However, since the DRAC approved a different drainage plan and the Notice of Intent refers to something else, it is confusing as to what is being proposed to be implemented under the Mitigated Neg Dec.

In addition to the drainage plan discrepancy, the lot and building pad configurations are different between that approved by the DRAC and the one shown in the CPAC and Mitigated Neg Dec documents. In the DRAC documents, the proposed detention basin is shown on Lot 1 with no proposed building pad and with a building pad shown a Lot 2. In the Mitigated Neg Dec and CPAC documents, however, Lot 1 has a building pad with a conveyance ditch to the detention basin which is located wholly on Lot 2, and has no proposed building pad. Again, it would seem appropriate that this plan design be the one adopted under the Mitigated Neg Dec, not the DRAC design.

Further adding to the confusion, the Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Neg Dec seems to refer to the plan in the DRAC documents, stating that "...onsite drainage improvements including a 8,275 square foot detention basin to be located on the eastern portion of Lot 1." This is, however, incorrect even if referring to the DRAC design since in the DRAC documents it is shown as being on the western portion of Lot 1. And again, it is not the plan shown in the Mitigated Neg Dec documents.

Regardless, it is confusing at best which drainage plan/lot configuration is proposed to be adopted and implemented under the Mitigated Neg Dec. If it is the DRAC configuration,

a new drainage study should be conducted. If it is the plan shown in the Mitigated Neg Dec (which should obviously be the case), then at least it was the plan recommended by CNA and the one that should be adopted.

Response 5-1

Please refer to Topical Response 1 and 2.

Comment 5-2

If the drainage plan with detention basin is implemented, who would be responsible for maintenance? Would it be Sacramento County? No earthen structure and ditch system is without maintenance needs. Berms, as proposed, need maintenance at some point in time. The proposed water conveyance between my home and the current Tomich residence, which I am more concerned about than the basin, will need clearing of debris etc. to stay at its design capacity and prevent over-topping.

Over-topping or failure of that conveyance ditch is my biggest concern. Although the Section C-C cross section on the Structural Design sheet in the CNA study is inaccurate regarding the home elevations (typos?), it is none-the-less clear my home is lower in elevation than the proposed ditch. The conveyance ditch will be less than 10 feet from my foundation, and it will be built higher in elevation than my property. Without maintenance, there is the real possibility that stormwater could overtop the ditch and flood my property. With proper maintenance this may not be an issue; but again, who is responsible for said maintenance? Who would be responsible for any damage to the ditch, or my home should the conveyance system fail?

Likewise, without proper maintenance a detention basin failure is a concern. Should stormwater flows exceed the capacity of the basin/ditch or berm failure occur, the resulting overland flow would likely flood my backyard and even more likely flood the lot and home of Steven and Alicia Bjerke located adjacent to me to the north. Their lot is even lower in elevation than mine and they have experienced flooding from overland flows from the Blossom Ridge parcel in the past. Concentrating even more flow to the vicinity (as proposed, flows will come from 9.31 acres rather than the current 1.4 acres) could result in worse flooding than in the past should failure of the basin occur. Again, maintenance will likely alleviate most of this concern, but who will be responsible?

It should be noted that if the DRAC configuration is adopted, then the proposed house on Lot 2 would also be flooded should a basin failure occur. Another reason this proposed alteration should not be adopted under the Mitigated Neg Dec.

Response 5-2

Refer to Topical Response 2.

Comment 5-3

An additional consideration that I don't see addressed is the type and location of soil that will be used for berm construction. Where will soil be obtained and who will ensure that it

is suitable for berm construction? This will also play into the need for maintenance. Soils with little clay content will need much more maintenance. Will soils be tested and by whom? Will there be oversight of berm construction to ensure adequate soil compaction?

Response 5-3

Section 18-6 “Import Borrows” of the Sacramento County’s Standard Construction Specification require import borrows to be tested for Sand Equivalent & “R” Value. Sacramento County Construction Management and Inspection oversees infrastructure constructed by private developers as part of a subdivision, including public drainage facilities.

Comment 5-4

Without assurances as to maintenance of the proposed drainage system, it would seem the effects regarding this component are not likely to be less than significant and may have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly. Both would preclude adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration unless adequately addressed. In addition, if a Mitigated Negative Declaration is adopted, it should be for the drainage system as developed and proposed by CNA and shown in the Mitigated Negative Declaration document, not the one reviewed by the DRAC.

Response 5-4

Please refer to Topical Response 2.

EMAIL #2 (COMMENT #6)

Angie Abegg-Sanchez. Email correspondence dated December 1, 2022

Comment 6-1

I am opposed to the mitigated negative declaration for the blossom ridge development located at 6331 Filbert Ave.

I live at 6350 Filbert Ave, Orangevale CA 95662. I have lived here since 1973 and have seen many developed properties. The manner in which this one is basically trying to sidestep a very important piece of planning is very concerning to our neighborhood.

The drainage plan is not addressing my side of Filbert and it will surely have a very negative effect on my property. I already deal with a full drainage ditch in front of my home, adding more runoff will only flood my property, and other neighboring properties. Please reconsider allowing this development until they come forward with a drainage solution.

The proposal of converting a septic area into drainage holding pit doesn’t seem to really address the drainage properly.

It is simply wrong to move forward with the plan as it is .

Please reconsider and move forward with a thorough environmental/ drainage impact investigation.

The current sewer water and drainage is not adequate to support this project as it is. Improvements should be made first.

Response 6-1

Please refer to Topical Response 1 & 2.

In addition, the project would not be “converting a septic area”; the current home is connected to public sewer.

The County of Sacramento acknowledges these comments; however, they do not present any issue or make any substantive comment about the adequacy of the IS/MND. It will be included as part of the hearing package, which will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

EMAIL #3 (COMMENT #7)

Mark E. Biddlecomb. Email correspondence dated February 12, 2023

Comment 7-1

Hi

Kimber,

Mark Biddlecomb here, I was on the phone with you and Dana Anderson last Friday. Again, thank you for your time and patience with all of our questions.

I want to share photos of the oak I was referring to during our conversation. There's just no way anyone can install a retaining wall and fill the area as proposed without taking this tree out. It's within 8 inches of my property line, as you can see. It seems a bit at odds to have an arborist report that identifies this tree as something to be saved and state/county regulations that purport to protect these oaks, and yet approve a drainage/cut/fill plan that guarantees this tree will need to be removed, wouldn't you say?

I look forward to seeing the grading plan map you said you could provide.

Mark Biddlecomb

Response 7-1

The IS/MND has been revised to reflect the removal of Tree #4572; please see page IS-34 of the revised IS/MND. Its removal will require an additional 27 inches of compensatory replacement plantings.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

1 December 2022

Joelle Inman
Sacramento County Planning
827 7th Street, Suite 225
Sacramento, CA 95814
inmanj@saccounty.net

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, BLOSSOM RIDGE PROJECT, SCH#2022110025, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 2 November 2022 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration* for the Blossom Ridge Project, located in Sacramento County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore, our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of

Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits¹

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

¹ Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will

require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov.

Peter Minkel

Peter Minkel
Engineering Geologist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research,
Sacramento



Sent Via E-Mail

December 1, 2022

Joelle Inman
Environmental Coordinator
Sacramento County
827 7th Street, Room 225
Sacramento, CA 95814
ceqa@saccounty.net

Subject: **Blossom Ridge / MND / 2022110025**

Dear Ms. Inman:

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for Blossom Ridge (Project, SCH 2022110025). SMUD is the primary energy provider for Sacramento County and the proposed Project area. SMUD's vision is to empower our customers with solutions and options that increase energy efficiency, protect the environment, reduce global warming, and lower the cost to serve our region. As a Responsible Agency, SMUD aims to ensure that the proposed Project limits the potential for significant environmental effects on SMUD facilities, employees, and customers.

We have no comments to offer at this time but would appreciate if the County of Sacramento would continue to keep SMUD facilities in mind as environmental review of the Project moves forward. Please reroute the Project analysis for SMUD's review if there are any changes to the scope of the Project.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at 916.732.5063, or by email at Kim.Crawford@smud.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "K. Crawford".

Kim Crawford
Environmental Services Specialist
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
6201 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95817

cc: Entitlements

PLNP2020-00104 - Blossom Ridge Subdivision:

I am writing on behalf of the Divine Savior Parish Community. Our Parish Campus is located immediately to the South of the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision property.

We reiterate our concerns previously submitted to the Orangevale CPAC regarding the purposed re-zoning and proposed subdivision.

1. The proposed density of the subdivision far exceeds the density of the properties along Filbert Ave. The proposed density will result in an increase of traffic that will converge on the intersection of Filbert Ave. and Greenback Lane. The current traffic density causes backlog of traffic at the signal at that intersection. Our Parish campus has experienced significant damage due to vehicles using our parking lot to bypass the traffic light at that location.
2. We have many activities at our church and church hall in the evenings. For safety purposes, we have lighting in our parking lot all night. We are concerned that the proposed density and close proximity of the parcels immediately north of our property will be considered a nuisance to new owners of the proposed parcels as a result of our lighting systems.
3. We are concerned that the proposed subdivision will cause potential surface drainage issues for the entire vicinity, particularly on the south boundary of the proposed subdivision, which is immediately adjacent to our church property. The proposed grading plan indicates that the elevation of lots 13,14,15 on the southern edge of the proposed subdivision is higher than our church parking lot elevation and only a 6" deep swale is included in the proposed design, while a significant area of these proposed lots will drain to the South. (See Drainage Plan Cross-Section D-D, Preliminary Grading Plan) This will result in significant runoff from the improved properties immediately to the north of the church. As commented on by many adjacent property owners at the Orangevale CPAC hearing, the drainage design for the proposed subdivision is not adequate to prevent flooding of the adjacent properties. The proposed drainage basin in the Northeast corner of the property, as well as the runoff from the proposed lots and the improved streets will drain into a swale that is across Filbert Ave. This swale is already overburdened by the existing drainage patterns.

4. We request that consideration be given to reducing the density in the proposed RD 4 and RD 3 zoning to RD 2. This is more consistent with the adjacent property to the North and West of the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision. Please note that Orangevale properties are rapidly downsizing. This reduces the opportunities for homeowners, present and future, that want to stay in Sacramento County to have small farms or have a few larger farm animals. Orangevale is one of the few remaining rural communities where such opportunities are still available. RD-2 or larger lot sizes are more appropriate for this community.

5. Finally, we are concerned about the impact of SB 9 on this neighborhood and the continued development of the few agricultural areas that remain in Orangevale.

Thank you for taking all of these concerns into consideration in your review of the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision.

Divine Savior Parish
Campus Development Committee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edmundo A. Puchi'.

Edmundo A Puchi
Chairman

November 22, 2022

Sacramento County Environmental Coordinator

Sacramento County
Office of Planning and Environmental Review
827 7th Street, Room 225
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Blossom Ridge, Control Number
PLNP2020-00104, APN 223-0091-002-0000

Dear Environmental Coordinator,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rezoning, general plan amendment, community plan amendment and proposal to subdivide the current 9.4 acre orchard into 32 single family residential lots.

I've no doubt that, from an economic and a highest and best use analysis standpoint, subdividing this historic orchard is the correct and most obvious choice for this parcel. However, there are numerous concerns with the project.

First and foremost, the Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration indicates the proposed drainage system detention basin is located on the eastern side of Lot 1. However, that is not the design developed and recommended for implementation to the Orangevale CPAC at their April 19, 2022 meeting, nor is it the design shown in the documents that accompany the Notice of Intent for the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Further, the proposal approved June 2022 by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) and the one being put forth under the Mitigated Negative Declaration are not the same. The drainage improvements developed and recommended by CNA Engineering, Inc. (CNA) are different than those shown in the DRAC documents. The map in the DRAC documents show a basin on the western portion of Lot 1. However, the map in the Mitigated Neg Dec and the study conducted by CNA show it as being on Lot 2. This would seem to be the appropriate map/study/plan to adopt and implement under the Mitigated Neg Dec, since the drainage study by CNA show it on Lot 2 and is the one developed and recommended by CNA. However, since the DRAC approved a different drainage plan and the Notice of Intent refers to something else, it is confusing as to what is being proposed to be implemented under the Mitigated Neg Dec.

In addition to the drainage plan discrepancy, the lot and building pad configurations are different between that approved by the DRAC and the one shown in the CPAC and Mitigated Neg Dec documents. In the DRAC documents, the proposed detention basin is shown on Lot 1 with no proposed building pad and with a building pad shown a Lot 2. In the Mitigated Neg Dec and

CPAC documents, however, Lot 1 has a building pad with a conveyance ditch to the detention basin which is located wholly on Lot 2, and has no proposed building pad. Again, it would seem appropriate that this plan design be the one adopted under the Mitigated Neg Dec, not the DRAC design.

Further adding to the confusion, the Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Neg Dec seems to refer to the plan in the DRAC documents, stating that "...onsite drainage improvements including a 8,275 square foot detention basin to be located on the eastern portion of Lot 1." This is, however, incorrect even if referring to the DRAC design since in the DRAC documents it is shown as being on the western portion of Lot 1. And again, it is not the plan shown in the Mitigated Neg Dec documents.

Regardless, it is confusing at best which drainage plan/lot configuration is proposed to be adopted and implemented under the Mitigated Neg Dec. If it is the DRAC configuration, a new drainage study should be conducted. If it is the plan shown in the Mitigated Neg Dec (which should obviously be the case), then at least it was the plan recommended by CNA and the one that should be adopted.

If the drainage plan with detention basin is implemented, who would be responsible for maintenance? Would it be Sacramento County? No earthen structure and ditch system is without maintenance needs. Berms, as proposed, need maintenance at some point in time. The proposed water conveyance between my home and the current Tomich residence, which I am more concerned about than the basin, will need clearing of debris etc. to stay at its design capacity and prevent over-topping.

Over-topping or failure of that conveyance ditch is my biggest concern. Although the Section C-C cross section on the Structural Design sheet in the CNA study is inaccurate regarding the home elevations (typos?), it is none-the-less clear my home is lower in elevation than the proposed ditch. The conveyance ditch will be less than 10 feet from my foundation, and it will be built higher in elevation than my property. Without maintenance, there is the real possibility that stormwater could overtop the ditch and flood my property. With proper maintenance this may not be an issue; but again, who is responsible for said maintenance? Who would be responsible for any damage to the ditch, or my home should the conveyance system fail?

Likewise, without proper maintenance a detention basin failure is a concern. Should stormwater flows exceed the capacity of the basin/ditch or berm failure occur, the resulting overland flow would likely flood my backyard and even more likely flood the lot and home of Steven and Alicia Bjerke located adjacent to me to the north. Their lot is even lower in elevation than mine and they have experienced flooding from overland flows from the Blossom Ridge parcel in the past. Concentrating even more flow to the vicinity (as proposed, flows will come from 9.31 acres rather than the current 1.4 acres) could result in worse flooding than in the past should failure of the basin occur. Again, maintenance will likely alleviate most of this concern, but who will be responsible?

It should be noted that if the DRAC configuration is adopted, then the proposed house on Lot 2 would also be flooded should a basin failure occur. Another reason this proposed alteration should not be adopted under the Mitigated Neg Dec.

An additional consideration that I don't see addressed is the type and location of soil that will be used for berm construction. Where will soil be obtained and who will ensure that it is suitable for berm construction? This will also play into the need for maintenance. Soils with little clay content will need much more maintenance. Will soils be tested and by whom? Will there be oversight of berm construction to ensure adequate soil compaction?

Without assurances as to maintenance of the proposed drainage system, it would seem the effects regarding this component are not likely to be *less than significant* and may have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly. Both would preclude adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration unless adequately addressed. In addition, if a Mitigated Negative Declaration is adopted, it should be for the drainage system as developed and proposed by CNA and shown in the Mitigated Negative Declaration document, not the one reviewed by the DRAC.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mark E. Biddlecomb
Homeowner

Greetan. Joshua

From: Inman. Joelle
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Greetan. Joshua
Subject: FW: Blossom Ridge PLNP2020-00104

FYI

Joelle Inman, Environmental Coordinator

Planning and Environmental Review

827 7th Street, Room 225, Sacramento, CA 95814 | (916) 874-7575 (direct)

For zoning inquiries, e-mail: sacplan@saccounty.net

www.per.saccounty.net/



Planning & Environmental Review (PER) has limited walk-in hours at our downtown public counter. Appointments can be made for most services. Please see our website at www.planning.saccounty.net for the most current information on how to obtain services and to schedule an appointment.

From: Guerra. Andrea <guerraa@saccounty.gov> **On Behalf Of** PER-CEQA
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 12:33 PM
To: Inman. Joelle <inmanj@saccounty.gov>; De Courcy. Meg <decourcym@saccounty.gov>; Newton. Julie <newtonj@saccounty.gov>
Subject: FW: Blossom Ridge PLNP2020-00104

Andrea Guerra, Senior Office Assistant

Planning and Environmental Review

827 7th Street, Room 225, Sacramento, CA 95814 | (916) 874-2862 (direct)

www.planning.saccounty.gov



Planning & Environmental Review (PER) has limited walk-in hours at our downtown public counter. Appointments can be made for most services. Please see our website at www.planning.saccounty.gov for the most current information on how to obtain services and to schedule an appointment.

 Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Angie Abegg-Sanchez <archangels66@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 12:03 PM
To: PER-CEQA <CEQA@saccounty.net>
Subject: Blossom Ridge PLNP2020-00104

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments.

Sacramento Environmental Coordinator

I am opposed to the mitigated negative declaration for the blossom ridge development located at 6331 Filbert Ave.

I live at 6350 Filbert Ave, Orangevale CA 95662. I have lived here since 1973 and have seen many developed properties. The manner in which this one is basically trying to sidestep a very important piece of planning is very concerning to our neighborhood.

The drainage plan is not addressing my side of Filbert and it will surely have a very negative effect on my property. I already deal with a full drainage ditch in front of my home, adding more runoff will only flood my property, and other neighboring properties. Please reconsider allowing this development until they come forward with a drainage solution.

The proposal of converting a septic area into drainage holding pit doesn't seem to really address the drainage properly.

It is simply wrong to move forward with the plan as it is .

Please reconsider and move forward with a thorough environmental/ drainage impact investigation.

The current sewer water and drainage is not adequate to support this project as it is. Improvements should be made first.

Mary Abegg Sanchez
John Abegg
6350 Filbert Ave

From: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
To: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
Subject: RE: Blossom Ridge Oak # 4572
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 4:05:02 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hey Josh,

I had a call with some neighbors to Blossom Ridge on Friday. I need to take a closer look at the materials, but do you think this is accurate or can you help me with a response to Mr. Biddlecomb's concerns?

Kind regards,

Kimber Gutierrez, Senior Planner
Planning and Environmental Review
(916) 874-7529



Planning & Environmental Review (PER) has limited walk-in hours at our downtown public counter. Appointments can be made for most services. Please see our website at www.planning.sacounty.net for the most current information on how to obtain services and to schedule an appointment.

From: Mark Biddlecomb <mbiddlecomb@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2023 4:27 AM
To: Gutierrez, Kimber <GutierrezK@sacounty.gov>
Cc: Dana Anderson <dana-anderson@outlook.com>; Doug Elliot <dougelliot1@yahoo.com>
Subject: Blossom Ridge Oak # 4572

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments.

Hi Kimber,

Mark Biddlecomb here, I was on the phone with you and Dana Anderson last Friday. Again, thank you for your time and patience with all of our questions.

I want to share photos of the oak I was referring to during our conversation. There's just no way anyone can install a retaining wall and fill the area as proposed without taking this tree out. It's within 8 inches of my property line, as you can see. It seems a bit at odds to have an arborist report that identifies this tree as something to be saved and state/county regulations that purport to protect these oaks, and yet approve a drainage/cut/fill plan that guarantees this tree will need to be removed, wouldn't you say?

I look forward to seeing the grading plan map you said you could provide.

Mark Biddlecomb



