



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, April 6, 2016 7:00 PM
Eureka School District Office, Board Room
5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1. **Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance**
Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM.
2. **Welcome & Introduction of Members**
Ken Prager, Eric Bose, John Thacker, Virg Anderson, Barbara Singleterry, Suzanne Jones, and Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary. (Bill Bowen was absent)

A Statement of Procedure was read by Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary.
3. **Approval of April 6, 2016 Agenda**
Motion was made to approve the agenda. Motion seconded and passed, 6-0.
4. **Approval of March 2, 2016 Minutes**
Motion was made to approve the minutes. Motion seconded and passed, 6-0.
5. **Public Safety Reports:**
 - A. Placer County Sheriff's Office – No report was given.
 - B. California Highway Patrol – No report was given.
 - C. South Placer Fire District – No report was 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).

Monica Sandgathe read a statement during the Public Comment Period. She has been a resident of Granite Bay for almost 30 years. Her daughter attended Eureka School District and her family loves calling Granite Bay their home. She is very concerned about the increase in traffic patterns along the Douglas corridor and how it is affecting the well-being of the community we all live in. When she comes home from work between 5:30 and 6:00 PM it takes her two, sometimes three red light changes to get through the signal at Sierra College (east) and Douglas Boulevard. When she leaves her house for work at 7:45 AM, it can take up to 5 minutes to make a right turn onto west bound Douglas Boulevard between Barton and Seeno. She is asking this MAC to pay careful attention to how future developments in Granite Bay will affect the traffic along the Douglas corridor as she doesn't feel the current infrastructure can handle additional traffic. Now that the Event Center is beginning construction at Quarry Pond which will cause major traffic jams if there is a 200+ person event on weekday evenings or when traffic flows are at their highest.



The MAC is composed of appointed community members whose purpose is to advise the Board of Supervisors about activities and problems of the area represented. Residents are encouraged to attend and talk about issues important to them. More info at www.placer.ca.gov/bos/mac. Placer County is committed to ensuring that persons with disabilities are provided the resources to participate fully in public meeting. If you require disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aid or services, to attend or participate in this meeting, please contact the Board of Supervisor's Office.

The rate of growth and difficulty traveling in our Granite Bay community should alarm the MAC. This is not the rural, peaceful setting it is touted to be. Douglas Boulevard has become a byway for cars traveling from Folsom to Roseville and encouraging more development that will use this corridor will cause more stoplights to be needed and gridlock among our neighborhoods.

Ms. Sandgathe closed her statement by asking the MAC to refrain from approving more commercial or high density residential development along this corridor.

Resident Frank Calton spoke to the MAC regarding his concerns on the Douglas Boulevard Development traffic impacts. Mr. Calton referenced the Granite Bay Community Plan Circulation Element and highlighted its purposes, recommendations and the primary problem. He expressed his opinion that there are no easy solutions to this problem, but he recommends that no new development be approved as the solution.

Victor Becket expressed his opposition of the proposed Park at Granite Bay project. He feels it will create a negative effect on traffic, noise, etc. Mr. Becket announced his candidacy for Placer County Supervisor, District 4.

Sandy Harris expressed her ongoing concerns regarding traffic and thinks the MAC needs to be more proactive in upholding the current plan designations.

Larissa Berry expressed her concerns regarding traffic impacts created by all of the rezoning being allowed and feels that the Granite Bay Community Plan is being ignored.

Chris Quinn told the MAC that he moved to Granite Bay because Granite Bay had what other communities didn't. He feels that other communities chose a "heavily developer backed" route and that once those communities were built out the residents were left with a community that didn't end up looking as it was proposed. He feels that all too often Police and Fire are left to pick up the pieces. Mr. Quinn fears that Granite Bay will be facing an increase in crime and emergency responses with the proposed developments and that no new services will be provided.

John Masha reported on his neighbor that is running a chop shop and encroaching the flood plain. The violation has been ongoing for the last 16 years. Every individual at the County is aware of the mess. With the help of Supervisor Uhler, the county has acknowledged the violation. He is now sixty days into the process and to date neighbor still has not complied. His neighbor has retained an attorney and has asked for an extension. Mr. Masha expressed his gratitude for the support that Supervisor Uhler and Ashley Brown have provided, but enough is enough. Mr. Masha is requesting that no extension be given.

Corrie Rossman explained that her property backs up to proposed home for the aging. She moved to Granite Bay 7 years ago and chose this community because it was land locked. She is concerned about the increase in traffic as the traffic already creates so much noise, she is unable to leave her windows open.

Dave Harris expressed his concerned regarding all of the memory care facilities in this area and the impact they have on the fire services.

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

Supervisor Uhler informed attendees that the Roseville/Granite Bay Chamber of Commerce will be holding a candidate's forum and that information on that event can be found on the Chamber's website.

Supervisor Uhler also reported that there are new parking restrictions near Lake Clementine and Hidden Falls Park. Supervisor Uhler reported that the areas of concern are along narrow, county-maintained roads near the parks. The move follows numerous safety complaints from area residents, park staff and the California Highway Patrol. In approving the ordinance, supervisors urged staff to report back on other alternatives to relieve the burden on the existing available parking at Hidden Falls.

There were no questions from the MAC and questions were opened up to the public.

A resident asked Supervisor Uhler what could be done about a derelict house on Lake Court? Supervisor Uhler responded by saying that there had been a similar situation on Olive Ranch Road. He asked the resident to contact Ashley and they would get to work on remedying the issue.

Another resident asked why the local recycling spots have been closed down as he was told it is up to the County. Supervisor Uhler explained that this was misinformation, and that the county does not have control over recycling. Supervisor Uhler reminded residence in attendance that everything that is put in their waste bin will be sorted and recycled at the waste facility. There was additional discussion regarding how much of the landfill has been diverted as a result of the recycling program.

There was some discussion regarding care facilities and the impact they put on community resources, i.e., fire and ambulance services. Supervisor Uhler agreed that a closer look into the impact that the care facilities put on community services needs to take place. Supervisor Uhler will set up a meeting with the new Chief of the South Placer Fire District and report back at a later date.

8. Information Item:

A. B- Placer County Water Update

Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and San Juan Water District (SJWD) will provide an overview of water availability in Placer County and the Granite Bay area.

Presenter: Robert Dugan, PCWA and Keith Durkin, SJWD (15 minutes)

Supervisor Uhler introduced Robert Dugan and gave a background on water questions that have been asked at previous MAC meetings. Mr. Dugan has been in his current position with PCWA for four (4) years. Mr. Dugan began by thanking the MAC and Supervisor Uhler for the opportunity to discuss ongoing water issues. Mr. Dugan began by clarifying that Granite Bay has water. Not only is there enough water for current customers, there is more than enough water to provide water to the anticipated customers with water supply left over. Annual supply and usage numbers were presented. Mr. Dugan informed attendees that PCWA is going to fight to repeal mandates that have been put in place as a result of the drought. Mr. Dugan reminded residents that even if the mandate is lifted, everyone should be efficient remain efficient with their water usage. Our region is working together to fight of all of our rights to preserve our quality of life.

Keith Durkin Assistant General Manager with the San Juan Water District reported that in spite of how things have looked, we have adequate water, and the issue that SJWD has been facing is an issue with accessing and/or pumping water so that it can be utilized. The San Juan Water District service area was explained. Historically water usage peaked about 15 years ago. They have seen a decline in water use for many reasons such as reduction in usage due to meters, awareness, water efficiency, reduced leaks, stringent requirements for low flow water fixtures, landscaping, etc. It was further explained that the Granite Bay area is in better condition than the rest of their service areas, in part, because of the contract they have with PCWA.

Member Anderson asked for clarification on restrictions/prioritization between PCWA and SJWD. Mr. Dugan explained that the water table is actually rising because of the strategy they have implemented. Even in these tough drought years, the water supply remains good.

There was discussion between MAC Members and Mr. Dugan regarding rations of ag water to residential water as well as how many reservoirs PCWA is currently managing.

In closing Mr. Dugan explained that PCWA and SJWD are aggressively pursuing an approach that will put future protections in place so that no matter what, we are protected, and that more of our water remains up stream.

B. A. Parks, Trails, and Landscaping in Granite Bay

The Placer County Parks Division will provide an overview of the status and funding of public parks, trails, and landscaped areas in the Granite Bay area including a discussion of upcoming Park and Trail Master Plan process with opportunities for the community to address future needs and funding challenges.

Presenter: Andy Fisher, Placer County Parks Division (15 minutes)

Mr. Fisher provided a slide presentation to the MAC that showed facilities and the acreage associated with the parks and multi-use bike trails.

A map of general locations of landscaped areas was shown and information on such landscape issue as high maintenance landscaping, landscaping that uses a lot of water, pipes that are leaking and trees that are becoming a hazard was explained. The Parks Division has a consultant that is proposing some alternatives. Alternatives would be vetted through the community prior to them being implemented.

A map of the trail system was shown. Paved trails, future trails, completed trails, dirt trails/DG trails were included on this map.

An explanation of the actions that have taken place was given. Those actions are: In 2012 the Board of Supervisors made a policy decision to contract park services; On January 1, 2013 a landscape contractor began maintaining landscapes along Douglas Boulevard and in September 2015, PRIDE Industries stated maintaining all parks.

The next steps will be: Park and Trail Master Plan: Inventory 2016; Public outreach/workshops 2016-2017; Needs/fiscal analysis 2017; Document preparation 2018; Implementation 2018.

A resident asked if the Parks Division is going to be involved in public safety. Mr. Fisher confirmed that they would be involved in public safety.

Another resident asked if inmates were still used to maintain landscaping. It was confirmed that inmates are still used.

C. West Placer Storm Water Design Manual

Placer County is working on the completion of the West Placer Storm Water Design Manual which will require amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. The Design Manual is intended to provide standards that both conform to the mandates of the 2013 NPDES Municipal Permit and achieve Placer County Conservation Plan objectives. The Design Manual will aid the design professionals in the design and constructing of effective storm water management strategies to reduce runoff, treat storm water, and provide baseline hydro modification management. This Design Manual has been a joint effort between Placer County and the Cities of

Roseville, Lincoln, Loomis, and Auburn. A copy of the draft Manual can be found at www.placer.ca.gov/lowimpactdevelopment.

Presenter: Jennifer Byous, Planning Services and/or Rebecca Taber, Engineering Services. (15 Minutes)

As part of the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) and permit coverage under the State's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) small municipal storm water program, the County is required to prepare the Western Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual. It was explained that the Clean Water Act in 1987, includes storm water runoff and that the Central Valley Regional Water Control Board is responsible for issuing NPDES Permits. NPDES/MS4 Permits require agencies to implement programs to prevent pollution, improve and protect storm water quality, reduce storm water runoff, and enhance the ecologic vitality.

A slide depicting Stormwater Regulation Changes: 1) Current Areas under Stormwater Regulation in Placer County; (2) MS4 Permit Standards Regulation in 2013; and (3) LID requirements took effect July 1, 2015 was shown to attendees.

Key drivers in MS4 permitting is water quality treatment for: suspended solids/sediments; nutrients (nitrogen, phosphorus), metals, oils, grease, bacteria, pesticides, herbicides and increased temperature. The conventional stormwater approach was to collect, convey and detain large volumes of stormwater. The new Low Impact Development (LID) Approach, as it relates to stormwater, aims to mimic the hydraulic function of the undeveloped site by capturing, treating, and infiltrating stormwater as close to the source as possible and using small scale landscape-based features located throughout the project site. It is a total site design philosophy and approach that conserves and uses existing natural site features and systems integrated with distributed, small-scale stormwater management controls (BMPs) to mimic or recreate the natural water balance for a site. Examples of LID Projects were shown.

It was explained that stormwater regulation for west Placer County is a multi-jurisdictional effort between Placer County, the City of Lincoln, the City of Roseville, the City of Loomis, and the City of Lincoln.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was added to the steering committee. Their objective is to provide technical input to the steering committee and consultants on the LID design and site planning as well as species design. The TAC consists of 6-7 people and are made up of Architects, Biologists, Developers, Engineers, Floodplain Engineers, Landscape Architects, NGOs and Planners. In addition to the changes to

stormwater regulations the committee is proactive in public outreach making the public aware of the changes and how the changes effect development and homeowners. Two public outreach meetings were held on December 9, 2014 and February 10, 2016 to provide information for the public, developers, engineers about the manual and the process and to provide opportunities for input and review of the standards for the manual.

The West Placer Manual is available on the County website: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/lowimpactdevelopment>. There you will be able to access information regarding the minimizing of negative impacts from stormwater runoff due to development, Guidelines for LID project design and the streamline permit process.

A sample Post-Construction Storm Water Quality Plan was shown. The Post-Construction Storm Water Quality Plan is an Excel based MS4 Permit compliance tool that helps establish BMP Selection, calculates runoff reduction, provides a standard format and examples.

A slide depicting requirements by category (i.e., Small Projects, Regulated Projects and Hydromodification Management Projects) and their Post-Construction Requirements was shown and explained to attendees.

Site Assessments consist of existing conditions, constraints, soils, geology, topography, site hydrology, vegetation and contamination. Side Design Measures consist of stream setbacks and buffers, soil quality improvement and maintenance, tree planting and preservation, rooftop and impervious area disconnection, porous pavement, vegetated swales, rain barrels and cisterns.

Hydromodification Management occurs when large projects are adding > 1 acre of impervious surface, match pre-development flow rates from 2-year, 24-hour storm and may require additional detention.

Draft Code Amendments can be found in Storm Water Quality (Chapter 8) and consist of the implemented design standards, define LID and strategies of the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual, i.e., "Where applicable", "Comply with" and "Consistent with". Other Draft Code Amendments are found in the Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control (Chapter 15), Design Standards and Improvements (Chapter 16) – Shown on tentative maps, Setbacks and Yards (Chapter 17) – Define permeable paving and provide flexibility for the County to require the use of permeable materials.

The presentation concluded with a slide depicting the boundaries and areas applicable to the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual.

9. Action Item:

A. Proposed Greyhawk III Project

Greyhawk III is a proposal to develop a 72-unit residential development on a 20.55-acre site (approximately 17.5 net acres) at the northeast corner of Sierra College Boulevard and Eureka Road, 326 feet west of Greyhawk Drive in Granite Bay. The site consists of two parcels: The "eastern portion," an 11.65 acre (10.62 net acres) parcel (APN 048-151-088-000), and the "western portion," an 8.9 acre (7.01 net acres) parcel (APN 048-151-086-000). The project would include a Planned Residential Development (PD) of twenty-eight detached, single-family residences on the eastern portion of the site and forty-four attached residential "halfplex" units on the western portion.

The applicant is requesting a rezoning of the eastern parcel of the project site from RS-B-40 PD = 2.0 (Residential Single Family, Combining Building Site of 40,000 square feet, Planned Residential Development of 2.0 units per acre) to RS-B-18 PD = 2.8 (Residential Single Family, Combining Building Site of 18,000 square feet, Planned Residential Development of 2.8 units per acre).

Presenter: Chris Schmidt, Placer County Senior Planner (45 Minutes)

A project overview was provided to attendees of the meeting by Chris Schmidt, with maps and photos showing the project site and its location, and flood plain area. Mr. Schmidt provided attendees with an explanation of the two different housing types that are being proposed for this project for each parcel.

Features of the proposed project such as open space, tree impacts, landscaping, parks and trails (tot lot, gazebo) and trail paths were shown on maps, as well as photos of the Eureka Road frontage were shown. Photos of the flood plain and sewer access were shown and a photo showing the proximity of the proposed project to Greyhawk II were also shown. It was explained that the entryway to the project will be gated, hardscaped, landscaped, and that the pedestrian access gate will be open from dawn to dusk. The fencing plan for this project was shown including a

sound wall along the Eureka Road portion of the project. Noise Impacts require that a 6-10ft sound wall adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard be included in this project. In addition to the sound wall, this project will include wrought Iron fencing. There will be 135 parking spaces provided on east side and 102 spaces on west.

Because of the highly visible residences located along Sierra College Boulevard and Eureka Road, the proposed project will be required to have enhanced facades that may include a combination of varied roof forms, facade element breaks such as off-



sets, and a two (2) story maximum height. This project will be subject to design review as a result of comments received from the January 2016 GB MAC meeting.

Clarification of tenancy was provided by Mr. Schmidt. It was explained that multi-family residential is a land use type and includes both rentals and owner-occupied units by definition.

The findings from the traffic study as well as required entitlements for the proposed project were recapped.

The tentative schedule for the proposed project moving forward is:

- Comment period for the Environmental Document is April 13, 2016 at 5:00PM
- Planning Commission - April 28th
- Board of Supervisors - June 7th (tentative)

Member Bose asked why there was going to be a solid masonry wall. Mr. Schmidt clarified that this wall would be a required feature because of the noise impact created by traffic on Sierra College Boulevard.

Member Bose asked if the trails are going to be publicly accessible. Clarification was provided and the public easement was shown on the map.

Member Bose asked how for clarification regarding the drainage swale and how is it going to continue to drain. Mr. Schmidt explained that almost all of the site drainage will flow toward Sierra College underground and said the Applicant could provide a more in-depth answer if need be.

Member Bose asked where the fill dirt would be coming from for the additional grading needed. Mr. Schmidt said he thought it would be coming from other areas on the property.

Chairman Prager asked for clarification regarding the required tree mitigation. Mr. Schmidt explained the County policy and said that most applicants opt to pay a fee for the mitigation.

Member Bose asked for clarification regarding the footprints for duets and single family residences. Is the builder allowed to build all the way to the building envelope? It was explained by Mr. Schmidt that the driveway must be 28 feet and that the homes must be built within the yellow area depicted on the map.

Member Bose asked for clarification regarding the maximum square footage size allowed on the first floor.

Marcus Lo Duca, representative for Patterson Properties, provided a brief summary of the proposed project and welcomed questions from the MAC and residence in attendance.

In response to Member Bose's question regarding the maximum square footage allowed on the first floor, Mr. Lo Duca clarified that the maximum square footage on the duet portion of the project would be 2,400SF on first floor and would include the garage.

Mr. Lo Duca further clarified that the fencing shown on the fencing plan was chosen as so that it would match/closely resemble the fencing used in the Greyhawk II project.

Mr. Lo Duca passed out photos of possible designs for both the duet homes and the single family residents to the MAC.

Traffic impacts were discussed as was the Developers history as a commercial developer and the lack of interest in the currently zoned commercial parcel of the proposed project. Further conversation regarding use of the site as a commercial site and the need/want for that type of product. Mr. Lo Duca explained that overall small commercial centers are just not doing well and that this particular property has been zoned commercial for 27 years. Even in the 10 years of the boom in commercial development this property has still not been developed/built.

Questions were compiled and responses provide after.

Member Singleterry asked if the access to this project allows for full movement. Mr. Lo Duca confirmed that it does allow for full movement.

Chairman Prager asked if the turn lane can handle the stacking requirements/needs even with a gated entrance. Mr. Lo Duca confirmed that more than enough stacking distance has been provided to meet the requirement.

Resident Joann Jackson asked why is there a need for a gate if its open during the day? What's the point? She doesn't understand who is going to benefit who is going to benefit from the 7 additional houses? Is the traffic because of the single entrance? Why can't there be an exit only on Sierra College?

Resident Shannon Quinn asked why there is not an entire design review on this project and why is the design review limited to the frontage units? Why is there not a one story height limit? How were the calculations calculated for daily trips? Correlation between housing sizes. Who pays for the traffic data? February 11th was a collaboration day at the high school and finds it to be misleading.

Mr. Quinn expressed his dissatisfaction regarding the date the traffic study was conducted, and asked if another contractor with the City of Roseville also relied on

the same low flow day to conduct the traffic study. Was it an oversight? Where is the professional oversight? Was it intended to mislead?

Resident Sandy Harris wanted other residents to know that there are no sidewalks in Greyhawk II. She urges the MAC to drive through Greyhawk II.

BJ commented that in looking at the land use allocated through the Community Plan, it looks like the split is almost high density and medium high density. She feels they pushed this project right to the limits. She would recommend that in total we only use 60 acres of high density and 400 acres for medium density. We are cracking this quickly. Granite Grove is selling quickly. She doesn't think there is a shortage of people who want to live in GB.

Dan Rich commented that traffic is very difficult and dangerous at this intersection. It's a safety concern. Why would you support a rezone on this project? Idea of a commercial development would allow for a way in off of Sierra College. Could help mitigate traffic?

What was the original zoning for Greyhawk II?

Responses to the questions are as follows:

Stephanie (Placer County) explained that trip generations are standardized. They used the multi-family rate. She explained that she cannot speak to the date the data was collected but that there is no concern of collusion. Mr. Lo Duca clarified that the data was collected in January not February. Mrs. Quinn continued to dispute the findings of the traffic study. Mr. Lo Duca read an excerpt from the final traffic study.

Chris (Placer County) addressed the question regarding design review and the enhanced facade. He explained that the entire project will come in for design review of all components of the project and that the gate being open from dawn to dusk, is the developers preference.

Additional Questions/Discussion MAC:

Member Anderson asked if there was going to be a signal for this project. It was explained that this project does not meet the threshold for a signal.

Chairman Prager asked for clarification regarding the "trigger" for a signal. Stephanie explained that although this project is not currently planned for a signal, a signal has been identified as a possible solution to mitigate traffic if the LOS goes up, etc.

Member Bose does not think this project meets the requirements of a PD. Member Bose read the relevant section from the Community Plan for the MAC. That combined with the loss of significant vegetation, conditional use permit, no architectural drawings, no home builder, and no specified design guidelines makes

him uncomfortable. Member Bose went on to say that he does not have a problem with the requested rezone from commercial to residential. He further went on to say that there are just too many unknown factors with this project as currently proposed. Not enough certainty has been provided.

Member Bose made the motion to deny recommendation to the Planning Commission of the project as currently proposed. Member Thacker seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6-0.

10. **Adjournment** to next regular meeting on May 4, 2016
Meeting adjourned at 10:10 PM.