Subject: California Northstate University Medical Center Project (PLNG18-110) Response Letter to 4th Routing Comment Letter.

Dear Ms. Kirchgessner:

Please see responses to the comments provided by agencies from the 4th routing of the comment letter dated March 13th, 2020. The sequence of the responses start by addressing the comments from the Development Services – Planning Division and work through the attached comments provided by departments and agencies.

Development Services Planning Division:

The comments regarding plan submittal documents, drainage, and access circulation have been addressed. The responses to the questions from the preliminary drainage assessment are addressed under the attached comments section in this letter. Furthermore, the submittal packet contains the updated Access/Circulation exhibit for review.

Attached Comments:

City of Elk Grove Engineering Services Division:

1. Page 4 – The 200-year Floodplain section is insufficient. Provide a site plan, which includes the 200-year floodplain delineation along with the flood depths and building elevations. I also recommend using the updating 200-year floodplain map (with parcels) that was provided to you.

Wood Rodgers’ Response: Additional narrative relating to background, hydrology and hydraulic analysis as well as mapping has been added to the report to describe the pre-project and post-project 200-year conditions.

2. Page 6 – The reference to Figure 6 in the last paragraph is incorrect;

Wood Rodgers’ Response: The references to Figure 6 on page 6 have been changed to Figure 8 (Post-Project Site Imperviousness)

3. Page 6 – The post project impervious area is 69.8% whereas Figure 8 shows 70.6%;

Wood Rodgers’ Response: The reference to the post-project percent impervious is 70.7% on Figure 8 and the text.

4. Page 9 – Provide the Contech supporting documentation;
Wood Rodgers’ Response: Contech supporting documentation has been copied in pdf format into Appendix B.

5. **Provide a table which combines Tables 2 and 4 and includes the existing and post-project 100-year peak flows (previous comment);**

Wood Rodgers’ Response: Wood Rodgers responded to the previous comment by explaining that Table 2 and Table 4 elements do not correlate well in a side by side item by item comparison table as requested. The original comment from the first City review was based on an erroneous list of the same model elements in both tables in the original submittal (Sept 2019). In the September 2019 Table 4, the SacCalc Element list in column 1 was erroneously listing the existing conditions element labels rather than the post-project elements, giving the appearance that a side-by-side comparison could be made. The downstream junction elements along West Taron Drive that are similar between the updated two tables are listed in Table 5, providing a more valid comparison of flows between existing and post-project conditions.

6. **Appendix B: LID Credits and Treatment BMP Sizing Calculation – provide the electronic files;**

Wood Rodgers’s Response: Digital files were previously provided on a thumb drive attached to the last submittal. Wood Rodgers can provide additional copies upon request if this is lost during the review process.

7. **Figures 9 and 10: Some of the bio-retention areas shown in Figure 10 (Storm Water Quality Phase 1) are not shown in Figure 9 (Storm Water Quality Ultimate Conditions), provide an explanation as to why the bio-retention areas are not shown in the ultimate buildout condition;**

Wood Rodgers’ Response: All Phase 1 bio-retention facilities do not carry forward in subsequent phases. As site layouts are changed during phasing some bio-retention areas are deconstructed and replaced in other areas within the site. Language explaining these changing conditions has been added to the text of the report.

8. **Will the proposed mechanical filtration points be located within the City’s right-of-way?**

Wood Rodgers’ Response: All hydraulically operated (passive) filtration units will located outside of the City’s right-of-way and owned, operated, and maintained by the private property owner.

No comments from Caltrans were provided in their latest review, therefore Wood Rodgers assumes that all drainage issues have been satisfied with respect to Caltrans.

**Caltrans:**

See attached updated ingress only emergency vehicle left turn pocket exhibit.