

**Exhibit A**  
**Response to Request for Additional Information**

This Exhibit provides the Town's consolidated comments and applicant teams' response denoted in **bold** and *italics*.

**General Comments for Project Description/Justification:**

1. The requested concessions for Affordable Housing are not clear.
  - What is specifically being requested in terms of waiving tree mitigation?
  - What is being requested regarding LOS standards?
  - How many units are affordable?
  - What is proposed to ensure affordable units are constructed and what is the timing for their construction?

***Comments noted. Please see Exhibit B which contains a detailed discussion on the multi-family site and the requested concessions associated with providing affordable housing on Unit E. Exhibit B also describes the density bonus, waivers and parking reductions being requested.***

2. Is a portion of Lot D Commercial in the RMH zone? ***The boundaries of Lot D have been adjusted to removed RMH property. Please see the attached Tentative Map for an updated depiction of Lot D.***
4. What density range are you using for Unit E? ***The updated tentative map shows Unit E as an affordable project with a density range of 20-25 units per acre.***
3. Figure 1 needs to be corrected as it shows that the project area includes the Perkins and Johnson properties. ***Figure 1 has been updated, please see updated project description.***
4. Identify the preferred alternative. ***In response to comments received from the first submittal dated December 2021 we have elected to remove all alternatives and proceed with submitting one land use plan/tentative map.***
5. Clarify the number of Villages in Alternative 1-A, and describe what is the plan for lots D and Unit E and are these areas to be developed in a later phase. ***The proposed project includes four single-family units of densities varying from 2-6 and 6-10 units/acre. In addition, the project includes Unit E which is proposed as an affordable housing site with a density of 20-25 units/acre and Lot D which is a proposed mixed-use parcel which can accommodate commercial/office/residential uses. The project proposes to improve all properties (grading/installation of utilities) and then Units E and D would be developed according to the filing of a subsequent application for design review.***

## Environmental Review Application Comments:

### 1. Population –

- Item 1 - include actual population numbers for any of the alternatives. **Using a census average household size of 2.66 average household size for Placer County we estimate approximately 939 residents (application updated to reflect this number).**
- Item 2 – Indicate if the units to be removed are currently occupied and if any are rented to low-income households. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**

### 2. Hydrology –

- Item 1 – there are 3 drainages/wetland features in addition to the main tributary of Secret Ravine. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**
- Item 2 - there is no data on the culvert and the culvert location does not align with the depicted flow line. Is there a plan to divert the flow eastward since this is marked “yes”? **Application has been clarified that water is not being diverted from the tributary to Secret Ravine.**
- Item 5 should have an estimate – not just “limited’ or “consistent with approved plan” Item 6 should acknowledge the WQ Basins connecting with the unnamed drainage features/wetlands to the northeast end of the site along I-80. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**
- Item 8 should acknowledge the culvert crossing. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**
- Item 11 should acknowledge the drainages NE of the Secret Ravine Tributary. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**

### 3. Air Quality –

- Item 4 should callout correct distances to schools. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**

### 4. Transportation –

- Item 9 should reference bike lanes for the “-2” alternatives. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**
- Are there any trails proposed in the Open Space area? Describe the sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails. **No trails are proposed.**
- Item 10 – is there parking associated with the park sites? **At this time no additional parking is proposed for the park sites.**
- Provide technical details about how the Library Drive extension connects with the existing Library Drive with a large difference in roadway widths. **Sheet 12 of the submittal plan set has been developed to illustrate connection points with existing and proposed roadways.**

## 5. Public Services –

- Fire:
  - Item 4 - How many hydrants are proposed? Are any other fire-fighting features proposed? Why is no hydrant shown at Unit E? **Application updated to reflect this comment-fire hydrants are shown on the proposed utility plans.**
  - Item 6 - What is the distance from Unit C lot 50 to Horseshoe Bar Road? **There is a proposed EVA access to Day Avenue as illustrated by the proposed tentative maps.**
  - Item 7 – Describe the B-1 & -2 alleys and accessibility for fire protection/apparatus. **No alleys are proposed with this application.**
  - Identify what is proposed for the EVA access point. **The project proposes open pedestrian access and removable bollards to limit vehicular access.**
  - Verify if the proposed narrower streets pursuant to the roadway concession provide adequate room for firefighting apparatus. Include whether this is true for the dead-end roads on Alternative B. **The proposed roadways provide the necessary width to allow for firefighting apparatus. No alleys are proposed with this application.**

### Wastewater:

- Item 2 – the collector line should be shown on the utility plan and the location disclosed here. **Application updated to reflect this comment.**

## 6. Aesthetics –

- Provide descriptions for any signage and lighting being proposed. **The Hidden Grove Design Guidelines include provisions for lighting. No special signage proposals are included with the project.**

### Tentative Map Comments:

1. Provide a legend either on each sheet or on an overall sheet. **A legend has been added to all tentative map sheets.**
2. The Summary Table should include all the gross acres for the non-residential lots and shows a larger net acreage than gross acreage in the subtotal. The difference between gross and net for Unit A is not accurate. For Unit E, the gross and net are the same on the map and table for Alternatives Band C. Please recheck and correct these errors. Show off-site improvements that will be tied into on the map. **The summary table has been updated to reflect your comments, please see Tentative Map Sheet 1.**
3. Show and clearly label all proposed and existing easements. Add note stating such if none exist.
  - There is a PCWA/PG&E easement that crosses a corner of Lot 97/ Clarify and show on plans the utilities in this easement. **Comments addressed on**

*plans.*

- Is it both a 20" PCWA water line and a PG&E main (not shown?) ***Sheet 2 of the tentative map has been expanded in scale to illustrate the different easements which run along this alignment.***
  - Generally, no structures are allowed in easements. ***No structures are proposed within existing easements. The tentative map has been updated to clarify which portion of the PG&E and PCWA easement is being abandoned. Note that the portion of the easement which transects lot 97 in Unit A is being abandoned.***
  - Verify that proposed house/lot improvements will meet PG&E/PCWA requirements. Update project accordingly. ***Comment noted. House and lot improvements will meet PG&E/PCWA requirements with the abandonment of the easement as described above.***
  - Show PUEs on the tentative map, and not just on the cross sections. ***A 12.5' PUE is depicted on all tentative map sheets.***
4. Depict and label elevation contours on the Map and include the 100-year and 500-year floodplain elevations. Depict natural drainage courses and wetlands and proposed open space boundaries. ***Tentative maps have been updated (and scale of sheets has been increased) so that all requested information is shown. Please see Sheets 1-4 for more information.***
  5. Depict cut and fill locations and volumes including for Water Quality Basins. Depict locations and amounts of fill the project proposes within the 100-year flood plain and other information as to impacts to the downstream system, if any. The grading requirement is to show the buildable areas in green, cut in red, fill in blue and tree removal with Xs. (Existing elevations and tie in points are hard to identify and verify on the plans. Add sufficient information to identify tie in locations and areas of cut and fill.) ***The submittal set has been updated to include all requested information. Please see the included color cut and fill map (Sheet 8), the grading and drainage plan (Sheets 5-7), and the tree impact plans (Sheets 14-16) for more information.***
  6. Building setback lines need to be shown on the map (not just a sample of one lot in the Massing Standards). ***Building setback lines have been added to the tentative map Sheets 2-4.***
  7. Revise Map so that all street radii meet Town requirements. Clearly label all radius and tangent measurement per Town of Loomis standard drawings. ***As discussed further in Exhibit B, though our provision of affordable housing, we are entitled to the use of waivers or reductions of "any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development which qualifies for a Density Bonus. As illustrated on Tentative Map Sheet 1, the project will require the waiver of some development standards including roadway standards.***
  8. Identify local streets, collector streets and major streets including the traffic index and R- value 31. All streets must include centerline bearing and stationing. ***All***

*roadways proposed are intended to be local residential streets based upon our initial traffic calculations. Traffic index, R-Value and centerline bearing and stationing will be prepared during the creation of improvement plans per customary practice.*

9. Clearly label all cul-de-sac dimensions per Standard detail H-25 and H-26. ***These standards details have been added to Tentative Map Sheet 1 for reference.***
10. Alternative B-1 shows a residential alley. Verify the alley is a minimum of 20' wide per Town of Loomis standard drawing H-38. ***All alternatives to the project have been removed so this comment is no longer applicable as there are no proposed alleys.***
11. Curb and gutter section shall be per standard drawing H2, all sections are 36". ***All curb and gutter sections are intended to meet this requirement.***
12. Show all utilities and sizes and where they tie into existing facilities. (The Grading and Drainage plan shows the storm drainsystem, and the Sewer and Water Plan (Sheet 8) shows the water and sewer plan, but both should show how/where they tie into the existing system). Provide a cross section for any underground utilities. ***Details showing proposed connections to existing facilities on Webb Street/Library Drive/Day Avenue have been provided on Sheet 12. In addition, typical cross sections for underground utilities have been provided on Sheet 13***
13. Show clear limits of work. Typical comment, but note two examples:
  - Library Drive is shown as half existing and half proposed on the Alternative A TentativeMap, but the linework does not clearly indicate where the existing and where new work will begin. ***Please see new detail provided on Sheet 12.***
  - Water quality basins 1-3 and Lot E Park are shown within the same boundary of the Open Space/Recreation area. Will these improvements be developed at the same time or will they be built with each phase? ***Please see Tentative Map Sheet 2 which shows Lot E (Park) being a separate parcel from the water quality basins. Additionally, it is anticipated that the water quality basins will be constructed concurrent with each development unit as needed.***
14. Identify all existing structures, including but not limited to houses, walls, septic systems. Label whether the structures are to be removed. ***Tentative Map Sheets 1-4 have been updated to include all existing structures as well as any proposed removal.***
15. Identify location of any retaining walls which shall be designed per Construction Standards Section 3-4 and Section 7 Grading Construction including details G-1 through G-7. ***All proposed retaining walls have been identified on the Grading and Drainage Plan Sheets 5-7 as well as Sheet 13 which depicts grading and utility typical sections.***
16. Depict locations of drop inlets and make sure they meet Town standards (distances appear greater than 500' in Units B and C (Streets 8, 9, and 10). ***All proposed DI's***

- are depicted on Grading and Drainage Plan Sheets 5-7.*
17. Depict locations of fire Hydrants and make sure they meet Fire standards. ***Fire hydrants are depicted on the Utility Plan Sheets 9-12. The project applicant will continue to work with the Fire Protection District to ensure Fire standards are met.***
  18. Once the location and size of any sound wall is identified as part of the noise study, such location and sizing shall be identified on the map. ***A proposed soundwall is illustrated on Tentative Map Sheets 3&4. The final height of this soundwall will be confirmed with the acoustical consultant during the preparation of the noise study for the project EIR.***
  19. Provide better detail or a callout on the culvert crossing and align it with the actual flow line. (The map only indicates a 5x10' culvert. Since roadway lane pavement alone is 36' there would need to be multiple 5x10' culverts end to end, but it is unclear what exactly is proposed). ***Additional detail on the culvert crossing has been provided on Sheets 6 & 13.***
  20. It appears the project includes both Commercial and High-Density Residential (apartments). (Provide site, utility and grading/drainage plans for these portions of the project for Town review.) ***Proposed grading and utilities for the commercial (Lot D) and high-density residential (Unit E) parcels are covered in this plan set. Further detailed design for these two properties will occur once an end user is identified and design review can commence. This is anticipated to occur subsequent to the approval of the Hidden Grove project.***

#### **Contextual Map Comments:**

1. Natural drainage courses are not shown. ***Natural Drainage Courses have been added to the contextual maps.***
2. Contour elevations not shown with the contour lines. ***Contour elevations have been added to the contextual maps (see Contextual Map Sheet 2).***
3. Surrounding pavement width not shown. ***Contextual Map Sheet 2 has been updated to include surrounding street widths. Please note that these measurements are approximate and subject to verification during final engineering.***
4. All the wetlands should be shown and the proposed open space should be called out in relation to those features. ***Wetlands and proposed open space lots have been added to Contextual Map Sheet 6 and are also included on Tentative Map Sheets 1-4.***
5. Contextual Map 3 has the wrong narrative text with photos K, L, and M (the text is mismatched with the photo). ***The contextual map has been corrected to reflect this comment.***

#### **Conceptual Grading Plan and Drainage Comments:**

1. Show proposed contours for the entire site. Label existing elevation contours. Existing elevations and tie in points are hard to identify and verify on the plans. ***The grading and drainage plans (Sheet 5-7) have been updated to provide additional detail and readability.***

2. The grading plan doesn't show where the grading will occur or what the pre- vs. post- grading would be and is also missing the actual graded quantity data. Cut/Fill/balance should be provided in cubic yards. There is no information on retaining wall height in the Grading Plan. Blasting locations in general should be identified as it could affect nearby homes and requires some mitigating action to ensure safety. ***The grading and drainage plans (Sheet 5-7) have been updated to provide additional detail and readability. A cut and fill map has been included (Sheet 8) and retaining wall heights have been added. Note that the submitted geotechnical report indicated that blasting may be required in some areas but that specific locations will not be known until more detailed exploratory work begins during site construction. Suitable mitigation measures related to blasting should be developed during the course of the preparation of the EIR.***
3. Label and show the area of disturbed soil for each alternative. ***With the elimination of project alternatives this comment is no longer applicable.***
4. Show Rock Outcroppings on Grading Map. ***Rock outcroppings are now shown on the grading map (Sheets 5-7).***
5. Show 100-Year and 500-year Floodplain elevation on Grading Map and provide FIRM information, WSE etc. ***The Grading and Drainage Plans as well as the Tentative Maps all depict the existing and proposed 100-year floodplain and well as the proposed 500-year floodplain. The Hidden Grove Drainage Study which accompanies this response to comments includes addition information related to floodplain characteristics and source data.***
6. Include overland flow arrows on the grading and drainage plan. ***Overland flow arrows have been included on the tentative map and grading and drainage plan sheets.***
5. Show proposed W/SS utilities on grading plan (or show storm drain on utility plan). The W/SS may be greyed out, but the intent is to verify separation of utilities and identify any conflicts or other issues. ***The utility plan Sheets 9-11 have been updated to show storm drain along with all wet utilities as requested.***
6. Include existing easements on grading plan. ***Existing easements are shown on the grading and drainage plan Sheet 5-7.***
7. Clarify where the discharge from the 36" outlet drain on Water Quality Basin #4 will connect. (This may be provided in the drainage study.) ***Utility Plan Sheet 10 illustrates that the basin will outfall to and ultimately drain to an existing ditch north of Interstate 80.***
8. A 12" SD with CBs are shown on Library Rd adjacent to the large culvert. Show how this SD will connect to the rest of the SD system. ***The storm drain system has been adjusted in this location.***
9. Section details shall include approximate heights of retaining walls, details of how lots will drain and approximate building locations. See redline mark-up. ***The plan set has been updated to include numerous details as requested, please see the grading and drainage plan Sheets 5-7 and the grading and utilities typical sections***

**Sheet 13.**

10. Grading plan included a few areas where grading does not appear to meet minimum slope requirements. Review and update grading plan accordingly. (See mark-up). **Comment noted and addressed.**
11. Show the location, elevation, and size of proposed building pads. **Building pads have been further delineated in grading and drainage plan Sheets 5-7.**
12. Is the Boyington Road reservation a proposed drainage area? The map appears to show it serving as a long basin connected to WQ basins 3, 4, 5, and 6. Some of the lots appear to drain across other lots (See unit B for example). Lots should not drain onto other properties. **The Boyington Road reservation is not intended to be a proposed drainage area, rather it's a proposed reservation of right-of-way for future road construction by the Town of Loomis.**
13. What is the large rectangle on the MH site? Will this also be a drainage basin area? **The grading plan has been updated to eliminate this area. Please see grading and drainage plan Sheet 5 for the updated design.**
14. While there are general callouts for the WQ basin design, there is no callout for storm drain outfall design. Identify how stormflows enter the basin. **Additional details related to outfall design have been added to Sheet 13.**

**Phasing Plan Comment:**

1. Indicate whether there will be phasing. If so, provide a Phasing Plan per Town requirements. **Note 10 has been added to tentative map Sheets 1-4 which indicates that, "This project may be implemented in phases according to market demand and the provision of services." No further phasing plan is anticipated at this time but may be prepared during the course of the preparation of improvement plans.**

**Reports/Studies Comments:**

As agreed in prior discussions with the Town prior to project submittal, specific reports and studies necessary for the project will be determined by the CEQA consultant as part of the CEQA review process.

1. Specific comments regarding report content:
  - Arborist report-In the report, or on the tree mitigation plan, include a table of the trees to be removed by the project. The arborist report just identifies trees the arborist determines should be removed due to poor condition. However, there is no list of trees by species, size, health, etc. that are to be removed by the project and no estimate of tree removal by alternative. This information is needed for analysis. The arborist report maps identify one tree near King Road as being in excellent condition (rated 5) but does not describe this tree in the tree tables (missing from the table). What type of tree is this, what is the size, and will it be removed? **Sheet 16 of the Tree Impact Plan has been updated to include a summary of all trees, their tag#, species and rating. The arborist**



**report has been corrected to depict what was incorrectly shown as an excellent tree to its accurate depiction as a GPS control point.**

- Storm Water Report- design criteria for the 5'x10 Box culvert on Library drive in the Storm Water Report to demonstrate adequate sizing. Include the design criteria for various detention basins in the Storm Water Report to demonstrate adequate sizing. The WPSWMM shall include separate calculations as these appear to be intended to both treat and detain stormwater. The project appears to drain into existing wetland and/or creek areas. Please review and address in drainage study. Project responsible to obtain any permit required by outside agencies, such as CDFW, Army Corps etc. **The box culvert is now 2'x10' in both the drainage study prepared by Wood Rodgers and the Tentative Map Utilities Sheets.**
- Drainage Study - provide overland release analysis. **Overland drainage arrows have been added to the grading and drainage plan.**
- Hydrology Report – include shed maps, drainage map, and calculations in compliance with Town/Placer County requirements. A stormwater modeling software shall be used to determine flows and size pipes. The report shall include all relevant items such as offsite run-on, and sizing of important drainage components such as detention ponds, culverts etc. **The drainage report establishes the sizing for the detention basins and associated infrastructure to mitigate for flows and accounts for offsite run-on. Detailed hydraulics for onsite pipe sizes will be provided during the preparation of improvement plans as is customary practice.**