



STRUCTURAL, MEP, CIVIL ENGINEERING & CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

Arizona California Colorado Florida Texas Lebanon Saudi Arabia U.A.E.

April 4, 2016

Dan Biswas  
VP of Development  
SimonCRE  
5111 N Scottsdale Road Suite 200  
Scottsdale, AZ 85250

RE: Dollar General Georgetown, CA  
Response to Public Comments  
County of El Dorado – Planning Commission Meeting – Item 5  
February 25, 2016

Dear Mr. Biswas:

At your request, TTG Engineers has prepared response to the public comments as it relates to the onsite drainage design currently shown on the proposed improvement plans for the Subject project.

The public comments are below with our provided responses. A copy of all testimonies are included in the back of this letter for your reference.

Testimony of Ken Presber

*Comment: "The on-site water, that was interesting you guys talking about that. Those are buried, if you've ever been to the site. I don't see how that water can go into that buried system and flow into a creek that's the same level as the project. It's gonna have to fill all the way to the top and run out -- out the top. So without pumping it, I don't see how -- how that's gonna function."*

Response: The proposed storm drain system for the subject project has been designed to provide a total detention volume to account for the difference in the pre-development vs post-development discharges rates for the 100 year storm event. The project will account for water quality measures prior to discharge along its historic path. All runoff will be discharged to the eastern boundary and to the southeast corner of the site. The invert of the storm drain system is set approximately 1-foot about the outfall elevation. Details are provided on the improvement plans and drainage report.

Further, the elevation of the building pad and associated parking lot is higher than the existing ground along the eastern property boundary. The proposed grade differential is accounted for with a small retaining wall along the eastern property boundary.

Testimony of Ed Hopkins – Mr. Hopkins's comments have been summarized from the recorded testimonies – A copy of his testimony is included in the back of this letter for your reference

*Comment: "Mr. Hopkins mentioned there is water flowing throughout the year and there are additional storm drain issues that have not been addressed."*



Response: Currently, all runoff produced on the site flows to the eastern boundary of the subject property. Additionally, there is an existing pipe culvert under Main Street (approximately 100-feet south of the intersection with Harkness Street) which conveys offsite flows onto the property. Flows from this pipe culvert enter the site and sheet flow to the east.

The project's proposed improvements provide for an onsite storm drain system to account for the onsite runoff and routing of the offsite flows through the project. Onsite drainage was divided into two separate sub-basins, a northern and southern basin. The basins discharge runoff at a pre-development rate to the eastern boundary to an existing waterway. The project proposes minimal improvements along the existing water way, based on findings from the environmental sub-consultant. At the point of discharge, runoff will follow its historic path. In addition, the project provides for the continuation of the offsite pipe culvert, onsite, to discharge at the existing waterway on the eastern property boundary.

*Comment: "The first storm water issue identified and detailed by Mr. Hopkins is the impact of a "normal rainy day" rather than the 10 or 100 yr storm as modeled in the hydrology report. Mr. Hopkins also mentions that the discharge from the site does not discharge along its historical path as mentioned in the engineering hydrology report but rather to the adjacent property, where it continues through a pipe, private property and the library site before it ultimately discharges to a wetland area."*

Response: The proposed drainage system has been designed to preserve the current flow patterns on the property. Currently, runoff exits the property along the eastern property boundary and towards the south eastern portion of the property. The proposed improvements mimic the existing onsite drainage patterns. Improvement include drainage outlets to convey runoff to the eastern property boundary and southeast corner of property to follow its historic path of travel.

*Comment: "His final concern is in regards to the capacity of the existing stormwater system. He states a regular storm event (dated December 21, 2015) puts the system near capacity. Therefore, if additional discharge is added to the system, "work should be done" or the impacts of the additional flow should be determined."*

Response: The proposed improvements include underground tanks and surface basins sized to store the runoff volume produced by the additional impervious surfaces such as roof area, concrete and associated parking.

The project proposes to detain volume accounted for the difference in the pre-development vs post-development discharge rates for the 100 year storm event. The 100 year storm would be considered a major storm event and conforms to the El Dorado County Storm Drain requirements. No additional runoff is expected to be generated by the proposed commercial development.



We appreciate the opportunity to provide responses to the public comments regarding the development of the Dollar General. If you should have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

TTG Engineers

A handwritten signature in green ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Mizerek', with a long horizontal line extending to the left.

Andrew Mizerek, PE



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNTY OF EL DORADO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ITEM NO. 5  
TESTIMONY OF KEN PRESBER  
FEBRUARY 25, 2016

COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
February 25, 2016

1                   **KEN PRESBER [SIC]:** I'm a 61 year resident  
2 of Georgetown.

3                   **UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** If you could  
4 state your name.

5                   **KEN PRESBER:** My name is Ken Presber  
6 [sic]. And -- I've been following this Dollar  
7 General thing, it's interesting.

8                   First of all, I didn't even know this  
9 project was even happening. My understanding, it's  
10 been on the books for about two years and now all  
11 of a sudden when the news paper came out, the  
12 residents found out. That's the first comment.

13                   Second of all, three parcels there, I  
14 believe we should deny this thing because I  
15 do think that it's very difficult to do  
16 anything with parcels up there. I know, I got  
17 property there and I've had to try and do a parcel  
18 split which took me three years. A boundary  
19 adjustment, I didn't create anything, I wasn't  
20 building. Three years to do a boundary adjustment,  
21 and now these people just come in, can go in there  
22 and bring three parcels together.

23                   The -- perc test on that, we were there  
24 yesterday actually. The one perc hole has got  
25 water in it, an 8 foot hole, it's got water in it

1 10 inches deep. I have no idea how you're gonna  
2 put a septic system, any kind. I've been in  
3 construction for 35 years, did a lot of these  
4 buildings, and I don't see how you're gonna build  
5 a dosing system with any sort if it's gonna -- if  
6 it's gonna work there. Even engineer won't  
7 guarantee it for more than two years. I mean, he  
8 basically in his report says it's -- it's a  
9 failure.

10 The on-site water, that was interesting  
11 you guys talking about that. Those are buried, if  
12 you've ever been to the site. I don't see how that  
13 water can go into that buried system and flow into  
14 a creek that's the same level as the project. It's  
15 gonna have to fill all the way to the top and run  
16 out -- out the top. So without pumping it, I don't  
17 see how -- how that's gonna function.

18 The air shaft, I haven't heard anything  
19 about what they're gonna do with that air shaft.  
20 James seen it yesterday for the first time. And  
21 he was quite shocked, actually. I mean he looked  
22 down that hole, there's nothing covering it. I  
23 don't -- there's no indication of what they're  
24 gonna do with it. So -- and then the set back  
25 for -- try and build on a piece of property there

1 and the County will deny you anything. If you got  
2 it within 5 to 6 feet of the property lines and  
3 they're gonna be there.

4 So those are my comments. Like I said,  
5 I'm a long time resident of Georgetown. I think  
6 it's a bad plan. It's too big of a building for  
7 that small of a lot. You got 9,000 square foot of  
8 roof that's gonna run off into that creek. -- I  
9 don't know how you are gonna mitigate that and  
10 the parking lot.

11 So -- thank you for your time.

12  
13 [END OF KEN PRESBER TESTIMONY]  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION  
TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO RECORDING OF  
COUNTY OF EL DORADO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ITEM NO. 5  
TESTIMONY OF KEN PRESBER  
FEBRUARY 25, 2016

I, Rachel Jackson, do hereby certify that I have listened to and transcribed the above-referenced recording audio to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages comprise a true and correct computer transcription by me of said audio recording.

Subscribed and sworn to by me on the 17th day of March 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rachel N. Jackson  
IITCR Certified  
Legal Transcriptionist



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNTY OF EL DORADO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ITEM NO. 5  
TESTIMONY OF ED HOPKINS  
FEBRUARY 25, 2016

COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
February 25, 2016

1                   **ED HOPKINS:** I guess it's  
2                   afternoon, I was ready to say good morning. My  
3                   name is Ed Hopkins, I'm a resident of Georgetown.

4                   My comments are on record with Planning.  
5                   I've written to Planning twice. The last  
6                   letter I wrote to them was in December --  
7                   identifying issues with the storm drainage  
8                   systems. I read the engineers report, I pointed  
9                   out the misrepresentation in the report in my  
10                  letter to Planning. I did get a nice  
11                  acknowledgment from them that they got the letter  
12                  but that was all I heard.

13                  Your staff's done a great job with this  
14                  thing, trying to make it look like it blends in,  
15                  I'll tell you they're not really there yet.  
16                  They've worked real hard. They've got Dollar  
17                  General off their concrete box concept and into  
18                  something that is kinda getting there.

19                  But my comments are about the storm  
20                  drainage system and septic system. Part of  
21                  the environment mitigated negative declaration  
22                  here. Staff has a, I call it an annoying habit  
23                  in their effort to get to yes which is what  
24                  they want to do, they want to help people build --  
25                  build things in this County.

1                   Of those, mitigated negative declaration  
2 this -- this site cries out for a full  
3 environmental impact review. There's water flowing  
4 through this site all year round. I pointed out  
5 storm drainage issues to staff but have not been  
6 -- have not been identified and addressed  
7 since I've pointed them out.

8                   This -- this -- the sewage system alone  
9 cries out for environmental review. These  
10 negative declarations are kind of a situation where  
11 the applicant goes in and says "I get to determine  
12 what's an impact and what's not. And what I'm  
13 gonna do about it." I think the County should  
14 look at a full environmental impact review on this.  
15 They've got in trouble for this -- for not doing  
16 this before. This place cries out for it.

17                   So I would hope that you would not  
18 adopt a mitigated negative declaration, and direct  
19 staff to go back and contract to have a whole  
20 environmental review done of this property. It's  
21 very environmentally sensitive. There is mine  
22 tailing there. The airshaft we're talking about is  
23 part of mine.

24                   I did bring -- Commissioner Williams  
25 asked me to email that to him -- I wasn't able to.

1 But I have a one minute, six second video of the  
2 storm drainage issue there. It shows what happens  
3 on a normal rainy day not a 10-year event or 100-  
4 year event that the hydrology report talks about.  
5 You could do with it what you wish. I couldn't  
6 email, I promised Commissioner Williams I'd bring  
7 it in today. So it's up to you guys to do whatever  
8 you want with that.

9 [discussion amongst multiple speakers re: proper  
10 transmittal of the video]

11 **UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** Could you  
12 describe what's in it?

13 **ED HOPKINS:** It's -- it's an depiction of  
14 the what -- what the engineers report represents  
15 that after there's storm water passing through  
16 the property that this 1.2 acre impervious surface  
17 it then just resumes its historic path. I'll  
18 represent to you that it does not, it actually  
19 goes through a flood control system to an adjacent  
20 property, across Orleans Street, underground  
21 through corrugated metal pipe, and exits onto  
22 private property -- passes under the library that's  
23 there, and then exits onto private -- pawning and  
24 flooded out area that's part of wetlands on  
25 adjacent property.

1                   My concern with the County was, their  
2                   system is at its near capacity with a regular  
3                   December 21, 2015 rainfall event, nothing  
4                   significant, one of the 10-year events or 100-year  
5                   events, just a regular deal. And I thought that  
6                   more work should be done with the storm drainage  
7                   system or at least to address what's -- what's  
8                   gonna happen with additional water when you take  
9                   a area of wetland which is what it now  
10                  basically and it into a 1.2 acre impervious  
11                  surface. I know it had a flood system built  
12                  into the plan, I've seen them but when the  
13                  system gets full it gets full.

14                  **UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** Okay, thank you.

15                  **ED HOPKINS:** That's the just of it.  
16                  But my primary just of all is this cries out  
17                  for environmental review, a full environmental  
18                  review.

19                  [END OF ED HOPKINS TESTIMONY]  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION  
TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO RECORDING OF  
COUNTY OF EL DORADO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ITEM NO. 5  
TESTIMONY OF ED HOPKINS  
FEBRUARY 25, 2016

I, Rachel Jackson, do hereby certify that I have listened to and transcribed the above-referenced recording audio to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages comprise a true and correct computer transcription by me of said audio recording.

Subscribed and sworn to by me on the 17th day of March 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rachel N. Jackson  
IITCR Certified  
Legal Transcriptionist