



COUNTY OF PLACER  
**GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL**

175 Fulweiler Avenue ▪ Auburn, CA 95603 ▪ (530) 889-4010  
County Contact: Ashley Brown (916) 787-8954

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, February 3, 2016 7:00 PM  
Eureka School District Office, Board Room  
5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1. **Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance**  
7:04 PM

2. **Welcome & Introduction of Members**  
Suzanne Jones, Ken Prager, Virg Anderson, Barbara Singleterry, Eric Bose, John Thacker, Bill Bowen and Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary. *(Members Eric Bose and Ken Prager were late and missed the voting and approval of the Agenda and Minutes and the Annual Reorganization of Officers items).*

3. **Approval of February 3, 2016 Agenda & January 6, 2016 Minutes**  
A motion was made to approve the agenda and the add item #4AandB regarding the Annual Reorganization of Officers for both Chair and Vice Chair to the agenda. Motion seconded and passed, 4-0.

A motion was made to approve the January 6, 2016 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded and passed, 4-0

4. **Annual Reorganization of Officers**  
A. **Chair**  
Motion to nominate Ken Prager for Chair was made. Motion seconded and passed, 4-0  
B. **Vice Chair**  
Motion to nominate Barbara Singleterry for Vice Chair was made. Motion seconded and passed, 4-0

5. **Public Safety Reports:**  
A. Placer County Sheriff's Office  
No report given.  
B. California Highway Patrol  
No report given.  
C. South Placer Fire District  
No report given.

6. **Public Comment:** Let us hear from you! Do you wish to share something that's NOT already on this agenda? We welcome your input at this time and kindly ask that you keep your comments to 3 minutes or less (or as determined by the chairman).



Cammie and Robert Cesaris, Granite Bay residents, spoke about their concern regarding the upkeep of Barton Road. They provided pictures to the MAC showing the need for restriping. Their concern is that Barton Road is very dark, with a lot of traffic and it is difficult to see. They asked if the timing for re-striping could be looked at and reported back on at a future meeting.

Larissa Berry, a resident of Folsom Lake Estates, commented about general development. She feels that Granite Bay used to be the "Gold Standard" for communities and that the Granite Bay Community Plan made this standard. She feels that project after project are being proposed and approved against the Community Plan and she asks that the MAC maintain the standard that has been set.

John Masha, a resident of Granite Bay, wanted to update the MAC on his former report of his neighbor running chop shop/auto repair shop and letting his business encroach the floodplain. He is here to thank the MAC, as he has, with the help of Uhler, received help on this issue and some actions are being discussed. A courtesy notice has been issued requesting his neighbor remove debris from the floodplain within 30 days. After the 30 days a notice of violation will be issued. He requests that there be no delay in this process and he has nothing but praise for Supervisor Uhler and the Granite Bay MAC.

Frank Colton, Granite Bay resident, wanted to remind the MAC that someone from public works is supposed to discuss the possibility of a signal at Berg, what the traffic outlook is for Douglas as well as accel/decel lanes, the impact on parking and the circulation plan and the regional traffic pattern that goes through the community. He wants to know if the regional traffic outlook going to be exclusively to the Auburn Folsom/Douglas area or will it be allowed to spill over into other areas.

Another community member wanted to let the MAC know that the Berg neighbors are opposing further development and they want to stop seeing the rezoning of every property on Douglas Boulevard.

Madalyn Kilian thanked the MAC for getting Auburn Folsom completed and expressed her appreciation for the MAC's assistance.

**7. Supervisor Report** (If Supervisor Kirk Uhler is not present, Ashley Brown will present)

Supervisor Uhler reported that the Placer County Animal shelter is expanding its hours. Previously it was closed on Mondays and for lunch from 1:00PM – 2:00PM everyday, the shelter will now be open continuously Monday through Saturday, 9:00AM – 5:00PM. The shelter will close at 5:00PM on Wednesdays instead of 7:00PM and on Sundays and major holidays. The expanded hours will increase visiting hours for the wonderful animals waiting to be adopted into a loving home. In addition to caring for thousands of animals each year, Placer County animal services also helps owners reconnect with lost and found pets, as well as secure dog licenses. Licenses are required for all dogs 4 months of age or older by law in Placer County. Licensing

helps identify dogs in the event they stray from home and help animal services staff reunite pets with their owners. Licensing also helps ensure that dogs are vaccinated for rabies, which can be deadly to humans.

Supervisor Uhler also reported that a specimen of petrified wood, was found in Granite Bay during a roadway widening project, weighing nearly 900 pounds, is close to three feet in diameter and, according to geologists from Sierra College and the University of California, Berkeley, is believed to be a laurel tree. Recent deep-trenching required for the widening of Eureka Road exposed a part of the lower-most section of the lone Formation where more than 10 fossilized logs were discovered. This tree is suspected to have originated in the Chico area before it floated downstream and was deposited in Placer County. Thanks to the property owner, Stephen Patterson, two of the logs have been provided to Placer County.

Supervisor Uhler provided an update on the right turn lane issue at Eureka Road and Sierra College that was brought up at the January 2016 MAC meeting. An explanation of why that is not possible at this time, was provided to attendees.

Supervisor explained to attendees how the "discretionary budget" is allocated. Of the County's \$800+M budget, 15% is board discretionary. As we discuss striping, etc. those items fall under discretionary budget. Discretionary spending needs to be evaluated by staff and discussed with all board members, etc. There is a balance of making sure the service levels of law enforcement are maintained and are priority #1.

There was conversation between Supervisor Uhler and attendees regarding the Highway 65 corridor improvements, the need to make those improvement, to insure that adequate sewer and water are in the ground and available. The Board is working with PCWA, looking at the possibility that would create our own utility making it more affordable and more attractive to industrial clientele.

A resident asked why developments are being approved while she, her family and neighbors are observing water restrictions during the drought. Supervisor Uhler explained that with all projects, every time a project is proposed, a consultation with water providers is always part of the process.

A community member asked why can't the County stop developers from applying for changes to the land use designations and wanted to know if there is something that could be done to the Community Plan now to stop this. Supervisor Uhler explained that there has to be a process and that there is a legal right to file and application for change in land use designations, zoning, etc. and there is a legal obligation for those applicants to be heard.

Supervisor Uhler further reminded attendees that under the law all people are to be treated equally. He reminded residents that they have a voice by attending the Granite Bay MAC meeting, through planning commission, and the processes provided. Preserving the quality of life is the toughest issue for Supervisors, but not

every project that is proposed is necessarily good or bad. Supervisor Uhler provided attendees with an example and urged residents to try to look at the process from a more global perspective.

Supervisor Uhler reminded attendees that he is happy to meet with them anytime to discuss their concerns.

**8. Information Item:**

**A. Proposed Residential Project, The Park at Granite Bay:**

Brief introduction by Lisa Carnahan, Planning Services Division. Presentation by Marcus Lo Duca, on behalf of Maverick Partners West (15 minutes)

The Park at Granite Bay is a proposal by Maverick Partners West to develop a 56-unit development on a 16.3-acre site west of Sierra College Boulevard, east of Eckerman Road, south of Annabelle Avenue, and north of Haskell Way. The project would include detached, single-family residential residences, and an approximately 0.8-acre park which would be open to the public during the daylight hours. The Draft Environmental Impact Report was released for public comment on December 31, 2015, with the comment period ending February 16, 2016. The purpose of this presentation is to give the MAC members and the public an update on the changes in the project which have occurred since the release of the Notice of Preparation. There will be no official public comments accepted on the Draft EIR at this meeting.

For more info visit:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir/parkgranitebay> or contact District Director, Ashley Brown at 916-787-8954 (office), 916-871-0202 (cell) or [anbrown@placer.ca.gov](mailto:anbrown@placer.ca.gov)

Lisa Carnahan, from the Placer County Planning Services Division addressed the attendees of the meeting and explained that the EIR for this project is in the public comment period. That comment period runs until February 16, 2016. Information for how to submit comments was made available to attendees at the back of the room. Ms. Carnahan encouraged everyone to submit their comments and explained that all comments would receive a written response.

The project team was introduced.

Mr. Lo Duca thanked the attendees for the opportunity to update them on this project. He explained that he was not involved with this project when it came to the MAC as an information item at the November 2014 meeting. Mr. Lo Duca provided community members with a brief background of the project. The project presented at that time proposed 94 homes on 16.3 acres, with a proposed amendment to the Granite Bay Community Plan to a high density residential land use category, and an accompanying rezone to match that proposed land use. The minimum lot size proposed at that time was 3,056

SF, with an average lot size of 4,403 SF. The proposed park was 1.4 acres in size. The project contained a paseo trail through the middle of the site, a rose garden and a tot lot, plus a landscape buffer area 10 feet in width around the north, west and south sides of the project. All homes were to be two stories.

After the November 2014 MAC meeting, Maverick Partners went to work on revising the project in an attempt to address comments made at that meeting. The revisions to the project include reducing the number of homes from 94 to 84, with lot sizes ranging from 3,172 SF to 6,795SF. All homes remained two story, and the landscape buffer around the project increased by 50% to 15 feet. The park remained 1.4 acres in size, and the project retained the paseo trail, rose garden and tot lot. The Notice of Preparation for the project's EIR was circulated to the public with this reduced density version of the project, which still contained the request for a Community Plan Amendment and accompanying rezone to the high density residential land use category under the Granite Bay Community Plan.

A number of community comments were submitted on the Notice of Preparation, so the Maverick Partners decided to engage the community in a face to face discussion about the project to better understand people's concerns and issues with the project. The project team began a broad community outreach effort, sending notices for three community meetings to residents in the northern portion of the island area, to review the project and get their feedback. Those meetings were held at the Granite Bay Library on February 19, March 18 and April 8 of 2015. Fewer than 20 residents, including repeat attendees, attended any of the three meetings. The project team also held a separate meeting with Eckerman Road neighbors during this period. In looking at the overall project, the discussion was not just one of gross density or number of residential homes planned, but the project team looked at the northern portion of the island area just south of the city limits to see what type of project would fall within a range of what already existed in that area. Two parcels away from the proposed project site, lots on Annabelle Avenue, and starting a couple of lots east of Eckerman Road, lot sizes on Annabelle Avenue are roughly a quarter acre or less in size. It is those lot sizes that Mr. Lo Duca's client decided to revise his project around. The revised project, proposed tonight, is the result of that effort, with a 40% reduction in the number of lots than the project had when it was first presented at the November 2014 MAC meeting, seeking a land use designation of medium density residential, with lot sizes ranging from 7,150SF to 17,196SF, and an average lot size of just over 9,000SF, or roughly a quarter of an acre, just like on Annabelle Avenue. There will be fourteen deed restricted lots along the periphery of the project that will allow only one story homes, with those homes being on the project lots closest to the neighbors' homes. There will also be other homes sprinkled throughout the project that will be one story as well in addition to the deed restricted lots. The variance requested only applies to those lots less than 8,000SF in size that propose a one story home and that variance is not needed for any of the

deed restricted lots on the edges of the project as those lots are at least 8,000SF in size. The homes to be built on the perimeter of the project will have larger rear yard setbacks to the property line, with one story homes on the perimeter of the project have a 35' setback, with a 42.5' setback for two story homes.

The project retains a park site of 0.81 acres in size, which can still accommodate youth sports practices. The park will be open to the public during daylight hours, with the gate to the project also open to the public during those same hours. To accommodate the larger lot sizes, the rose garden, paseo trail and tot lot were removed from the project. The project has also changed to direct its sewer flows on a gravity basis to the existing sewer trunk line on Sierra College Boulevard, with what was 17 lots to have individual grinder pumps that would feed into a force main back to the project's sewer line serving all remaining lots that are on a gravity system. In the latest discussion with county staff, only 7 lots will now have the individual grinder pumps. The project has retained the 15 foot heavily landscaped buffer on the north, south and west boundaries of the project.

Mr. Lo Duca informed attendees that last week, the Planning Commission held a hearing to receive public comments on the DEIR for the project, and a number of comments were made. Mr. Lo Duca went over the comments with attendees to clarify what appear to be misconceptions about the project. Those comments were: 1) There is no berm around the project. The berm is a small berm on the Sierra College Boulevard frontage of the project; 2) The EIR consultant is not the applicant's consultant. The EIR consultant is the County's consultant, as with all EIR's done in Placer County. The County directs the EIR consultant and all subconsultants in their work, regardless of who conducts a particular study, including the traffic consultant, who analyzed impacts to area intersections, including weaving movements, and the need for accel and decel lanes, as well as pedestrian improvements needed for the project; 3) The only wall being constructed by the project is along the Sierra College Boulevard frontage to mitigate noise impacts to four lots at the front of the project, and not all around the project; and 4) The project drainage system has been reviewed and signed off by both Placer County staff and Flood Control District staff, and will improve the localized flooding problem in the Eckerman Road area by detaining flows on-site and metering those flows out during storm events. It is not just the project engineer's opinion, but that of the county as well. The desire to improve the drainage situation faced by our neighbors is a key objective of the project.

Mr. Lo Duca reiterated that no significant impacts were found through the EIR analysis.

Member Bowen asked if there is a change to the traffic flow on Sierra College. Mr. Lo Duca explained there will be no left turn out permitted. Additionally, Member Bowen asked for clarification on the green area referenced on the map. Mr. Lo Duca explained that space will be used for water detention.

A member of the community asked if there is currently a range of home sizes and price range? Mr. Lo Duca explained that home size and price range are unknown at this time as home builder has not yet been identified.

A community member asked if because there is no left turn permitted, would traffic be required to make a U-turn. Mr. Lo Duca explained that that will depend on where the vehicle is going. Mr. Lo Duca reminded attendees of the meeting that the traffic study did take this into consideration.

A community member asked how can you ask for approval on large density homes without identifying the product. Mr. Lo Duca responded that all homes have to comply with the community plan.

A community member asked how the project is dealing with the surrounding agriculture. Mr. Lo Duca explained that agriculture is present throughout the county and that there will be a deed notification for all of the lots in the proposed subdivision notifying them of the surrounding agriculture. This deed will not be able to be removed from the property without County approval.

Neighbors of the project wanted to know if water be flowing all year long and if there will there be a mosquito problem? The project explained that water released from the water detention area will be metered out over a couple of day period. A brief explanation of how exactly the system works was provided.

It was asked who would be maintaining the water retention basin. It was explained that the water retention basin will be maintained by the HOA.

A neighbor of the project expressed his concern regarding the drainage basin flowing directly into his private drainage pipe. Member Bose asked if the pipeline in question is privately owned and what is the path of the drainage after it leaves the pipeline. The project engineer explained that no amount of water released from the detention pond, cannot exceed that of the pre-project flow. It is not allowed by the County. The water will travel through the private drainage and from there to the ditch on Ackerman, it will then cross Annabelle and continue west.

Member Prager asked if it would be possible to have the water flow to the east.

The project engineer explained that would be a flow shift, causing offsite impacts. The drainage route as proposed creates an equal to or less than impact. It has been vetted and included in the EIR. Further explanation of the drainage and its current flow was shown on the map.

Sandy asked what the purpose of the park as she doesn't see the purpose. She thinks this project is incompatible and inconsistent with the community plan.

9. **Action Item:** (No Action Items)
10. **Adjournment** to next regular meeting on March 2, 2016  
Meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.