

County of Placer
Planning Department

BOARD SUBMITTAL COVER SHEET

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Fred Yeager, Planning Director

F.Y.

DATE: May 5, 2004

SUBJECT: West Placer County Major Project Updates

SUMMARY:

The Board of Supervisors held a workshop on October 20, 2003. The Board heard presentations and provided direction relative to Placer Parkway, De La Salle University and Community, Placer Ranch, and the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan work program. The Board also directed staff to report back with a work program, schedule, and budget for the possible preparation of a community plan for the area west of Roseville and south of Pleasant Grove Creek. The staff will be providing status reports on Placer Parkway, Placer Ranch, and De La Salle, as well as requested information relative to a community plan effort for the west Placer area.

In addition, the Board acknowledged that the staff would be reporting back on these issues in 6-9 months. Although the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan program was also discussed on October 20th, the Board has scheduled a separate workshop, on May 18, 2004, for that continued discussion and update.

The accompanying report updates the Board and public on these proposals as well as some of the issues which have arisen as a result of consideration of the projects.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board provide direction relative to the Curry Creek Community Plan proposal; that the Board consider scheduling another status report/workshop discussion of the proposed west Placer major projects in December 2004, and that any additional direction regarding the Placer Ranch or De La Salle projects, prompted by this update, be provided as well.

**MEMORANDUM
PLACER COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Fred Yeager, Planning Department
DATE: May 5, 2004
SUBJECT: West Placer County Major Project Updates

SUMMARY:

The Board of Supervisors held a workshop on October 20, 2003. The Board heard presentations and provided direction relative to Placer Parkway, De La Salle University and Community, Placer Ranch, and the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan work program. The Board also directed staff to report back with a work program, schedule, and budget for the possible preparation of a community plan for the area west of Roseville and south of Pleasant Grove Creek. The staff will be providing status reports on Placer Parkway, Placer Ranch, and De La Salle, as well as requested information relative to a community plan effort for the west Placer area.

In addition, brief status reports on other major projects proposed in the west Placer area, as well as a new major proposal west of Placer Ranch, will be provided.

BACKGROUND:

At the October 20th workshop the Board provided specific direction on a number of issues.

1. "The County is very supportive of locating one or more universities in western Placer County. It is possible to resolve many of the issues identified by modifying the current project proposals."
2. "Amendments to the General Plan will be entertained in order to accommodate one or more universities."
3. "Existing planned development can provide much of the support uses, in immediately adjacent areas, especially housing, for both proposed universities. The proposed sphere expansion area can provide an opportunity for the private endowment needed for the private university and this alternative should be considered."
4. "Infrastructure needs must be met including the funding and construction of adequate sewers, water infrastructure from a surface water supply and roads."
5. "The landfill must be protected from encroachment of incompatible uses including most types of residential uses. The one-mile buffer for residential uses is generally supported, however an alternative form of buffering and/or a different standard will be explored and considered as a part

of the project review. Consultation with the adjoining cities and the Landfill Authority will be a part of the review process. The County would consider a project that placed the campus as far from the landfill as possible on the same ownership, and would consider on-campus housing if appropriately buffered."

6. "New development that uses agricultural lands and removes suitable wildlife habitat must be responsible for creating and financing a program that permanently protects other areas within Placer County."

7. "The Placer Parkway routing process must be considered concurrently with the planning for new development within the corridor being studied."

8. Finally, the staff has also been asked to bring forward a proposal for a new community plan to be prepared for the area south of Pleasant Grove Creek and west of the City of Roseville.

In addition, the Board acknowledged that the staff would be reporting back on these issues in 6-9 months. Although the Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan program was also discussed on October 20th, the Board has scheduled a separate workshop, on May 18, 2004, for that continued discussion and update.

This report will update the Board and public on these proposals as well as some of the issues which have arisen as a result of consideration of the projects. Because some of the issues are common to many of the projects to be discussed we have elected to address traffic and water availability separate from the discussion of individual projects; recognizing that these issues are bigger than the individual projects alone.

Related Projects - Status Reports:

PLACER VINEYARDS SPECIFIC PLAN

Placer Vineyards Specific Plan includes 5,158 acres located in the southwest corner of Placer County. The Plan Area is bounded on the north by Baseline Road, on the south by the Sacramento County line, on the west by Sutter County and Pleasant Grove Road, and on the east by Dry Creek and Walerga Road as shown in Attachment 4. Most of the Plan Area consists of undeveloped grazing and agricultural land with approximately 100 residences located primarily in the northwest corner of the Plan Area referred to as the Riego area.

The applicant's have prepared a draft Specific Plan that includes:

- A maximum of 14,132 dwelling units with a wide range of residential densities.
- The designation of a 100±-acre Town Center located near the center of the Plan area on Baseline Road at 16th Street.
- Neighborhood commercial centers dispersed throughout the Plan Area at key intersections, with each surrounded by higher intensity land uses to encourage pedestrian use.

- The co-location of parks and school facilities in the middle of each neighborhood creating a central gathering place.
- A network of open space corridors that will allow off-street trail connections, convey drainage, and preserve or allow the re-creation of wetlands.

The EIR Consultant, Quad Knopf, is currently working on providing the County with the third administrative draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. Some of the outstanding issues that still need to be resolved are the open space and biological mitigation measures for the Specific Plan area. It is anticipated that the third administrative draft EIR will be submitted to the County by May 5, 2004.

WEST ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

The West Roseville Specific Plan was approved by the Roseville City Council in February 2004. An application for annexation to the City has been filed with the Local Agency Formation Commission, and is now under study by the LAFCo staff. Annexation could occur as soon as late 2004.

The WRSP comprises an area of 3161 acres located west of Fiddymont Road, north of Baseline Road, and south of Pleasant Grove Creek. An additional 2365 acres are proposed as a part of the City's sphere of influence, implying that annexation will be requested in the future. The WRSP includes 8400+/- residential units plus 163 acres of commercial and industrial uses, and open space as well as infrastructure uses. (See attachment 4)

Regional Transportation Issues:

The regional transportation system will need major expansion and significant upgrades in order to accommodate the proposed projects in the West Placer area. Among the roads that will need to be improved or extended are Baseline Road, Watt Ave., Sunset Blvd. and Foothills Blvd. In addition, major improvements will be necessary on Interstate 80 and State Route 65 to handle increases in traffic from regional growth. New and innovative approaches to transit will be needed such as Bus Rapid Transit in order to address the air quality implications of the expanded transportation system.

The financing of transportation infrastructure is the most critical issue in providing for the future transportation needs in the west Placer area. The current revenue sources fall well short of being able to provide the necessary highways, interchanges and transit system that will be needed to serve the new growth areas. The projected cost of these facilities is rising at a high rate due to the cost of materials, environmental mitigation and right of way. As an example, the cost of the Hwy. 65 Lincoln Bypass has risen from \$40 million to \$250 million and may even go higher. The project has contributed to the current financial situation by allocating such a large share of our local and regional funds to this one project. Major unfunded projects include improvements to I-80 through Roseville and the Hwy. 65 widening from Lincoln south to I-80.

The rate of growth in the region could well result in the need for transportation improvements much sooner than anticipated. The construction of the Placer Parkway has been looked at as a long term project, but the need for this route could come much sooner depending on the rate and location of new development.

When transportation revenue is compared to the cost of needed improvements, there is a major disparity. While local and regional traffic fees are a significant source of revenue, they are currently not adequate to fund the long term transportation infrastructure that will be needed to serve the region.

PLACER PARKWAY

The Placer Parkway project is a key regional transportation facility in the West Placer area. The alternative alignments for Placer Parkway traverse the area of the proposed universities as well as the proposed new community plan area (referred to in this report as the Curry Creek Community Plan area). The processing of the two university proposals are moving faster than the Parkway route alignment process. This means that the Placer Parkway final alignment will not be selected by the time that the De La Salle and Placer Ranch projects are ready for consideration by the Board. Therefore, we will need to reconcile the entitlements that are being requested with the need to maintain viable Parkway alignments under study during the route alignment process. Actions that compromise the ability to select alternative alignments could put the route selection process and the Parkway itself at risk. This is because Federal and State agencies would not recognize a newly approved project as a reason to give up an otherwise feasible alignment. The final selection of the Parkway alignment is not solely under local control but must receive approval from a number of agencies.

The alternative alignments are currently being refined to reflect the latest information available with respect to environmental constraints. At the same time certain routes are being eliminated that do not meet the need and purpose of the Parkway project. The alignments will be refined further but the latest version of the routes to be studied further in the EIR will be presented at the meeting.

Water Availability:

The availability of surface water for new development in the west part of the County has been an area of concern for many years. The Placer County General Plan requires new development to be served with surface water in this part of the County. The Placer County Water Agency has repeatedly stated that their water "budgeting" has identified adequate surface water supplies for development within their service area that is consistent with the PCGP. General Plan amendments that increase densities, thus water use, therefore create concerns about water supplies and the ability of new development to be supported with surface water.

Recently, the City of Rocklin approved a general plan amendment and incorporated the Sunset Ranchos area. Working with PCWA, the City identified conservation projects that the project could fund that would make additional surface water available to the project, thus avoiding any reliance on groundwater, despite the increase in the general plan holding capacity.

With the construction of the new Lincoln and Pleasant Grove Wastewater treatment plants, substantial quantities of reclaimed water will be available to the west part of the County. The use of reclaimed water can account for 25% of the demand for water created by new urban development. In addition, PCWA is discussing additional methods of obtaining additional surface water and has recently successfully negotiated a trade of service area within Lincoln. This releases PCWA supplies by increasing NID deliveries to Lincoln.

By combining new sources (or trades as mentioned above), conservation projects, maximizing use of reclaimed water, and reallocation of "budgeted water" within the Sunset Industrial Area, PCWA is confident that the Placer Ranch project can be supplied with surface water. A portion of the proposed Placer Ranch project is within the industrially designated portion of the Sunset Industrial Area and thus has some water "budgeted" for use in that area. What still remains to be addressed are impacts on the extent or type of industrial uses or limitations that may be necessary if the "budgeted" water is reallocated to the entire Placer Ranch Specific Plan project area. This issue will be studied further in the coming months.

The De La Salle project presents somewhat different issues since it is in an area which has had no surface water "budgeted" to it. In order to address this issue the staff has worked with PCWA to assess the agencies land use assumptions that were used in determining their water budget. That study did not reveal any overly conservative estimates being used by PCWA, thus did not result in uncovering any over-budgeting of water within the service area. The De La Salle applicants have proposed the use of ground water until the new extraction from the Sacramento River is complete, when they would convert to that source of water. PCWA has confirmed that none of the water from the planned Sacramento River diversion is available to the De La Salle project. Thus the remaining options, not including ground water due to the PCGP and Board direction, are additional conservation, maximum use of reclaimed water, purchase of surface water from a new source, or reallocation from some other potential development area. These same options would be those explored for the community plan in this area, should the Board direct staff to prepare one.

Cumulative Issues:

The on-going review of the De La Salle and Placer Ranch projects, as well as consideration of other large regional projects has lead to several general observations about impacts that are likely to result from such uses and about the differences in the projects being considered.

As could be expected, these projects have stimulated other development proposals. For example, a large project has been proposed to the west of the Placer Ranch site, being called the University Park Specific Plan. This proposal reinforces concern over the impact of the County considering significant changes to the General Plan. Because of the County's willingness to consider the Placer Ranch project, this new proposal has now been submitted for consideration. Similarly, because of the County's consideration of the De La Salle project, a new community plan for the area and subsequent development of the adjoining lands, largely in the same ownership, is also up for discussion. Although such considerations are not illogical, they clearly raise questions about the long term sustainability of agricultural uses and the viability of successfully completing the HCP/NCCP, as addressed at the October 20, 2003 workshop.

The University Park property, controlled by Brookfield Land Co., is immediately west of the proposed Placer Ranch project and extends in three separate parcels along West Sunset Boulevard to Brewer Road on the west. The properties abut the east and north boundary of the proposed City of Roseville Reason Farms Stormwater Detention Facility. The project development area addressed in the project description includes 680 acres of the total 1,365 acres controlled by Brookfield Land Company. Of the 680 acres, approximately 84 acres is designated as open space and 596 acres is designated for mixed-use urban development. Of 596 acres, approximately 480 acres is designated for the development of 3,304 residential units and 20 acres for mixed use commercial.

The County staff has held two pre-development meetings with the applicant, the latest being on May 3, 2004.

Another observation is the significant difference in the two proposed universities, and how those differences will affect the adjoining development. In the case of the private university, there is considerable concern about the need to provide a secure campus environment and separating campus uses from outside uses. In the case of the public university the issue is the opposite; a clear desire to integrate the campus with surrounding housing, commercial, and business park development. These differences have lead to somewhat different discussions with the applicants about how the projects and the campuses will be integrated.

CURRY CREEK COMMUNITY PLAN

On October 20, 2003 the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare a work plan, budget, and schedule for the preparation of a new community plan that would address the area north of Placer Vineyards (Baseline Road), south of Pleasant Grove Creek, and west of Roseville's proposed annexation area. This proposal was prompted by the Board's direction to proceed with the review and consideration of the De La Salle University and Community project, the Phase 1 HCP/NCCP and the Placer Parkway project. Curry Creek traverses the area to be considered, thus the staff has recommended the name "Curry Creek Community Plan", should the Board of Supervisors decide to proceed.

Schedule: Once initiated, such a project, assuming a community plan level of detail, would take an estimated 36 months if sufficient staff and resources were made available. The initial phase of research, preliminary investigation into infrastructure, public outreach and data collection would take 12 months. The preparation of a draft plan another 12 months and completion of an EIR and public hearings the last 12 months.

Plan area: One of the first tasks would be to establish a boundary for the Plan area. An area of study, not necessarily an area to be developed, has been depicted on a regional map of the area. (See proposed plan area boundary map-attachment 5). The recommended study area would extend from the Placer Parkway alignment, just north of the De La Salle University site, south to Baseline Road, east from the City of Roseville's new sphere of influence and west to roughly Country Acres Lane. The proposed boundary specifically leaves an open space and agricultural buffer between the Sutter County line and the Curry Creek Community Plan area, is bounded by the Placer Parkway study alignment to the north, and does not extend north of the West Roseville Specific Plan area.

Preliminary concepts:

1. Incorporate smart growth principles in all phases of planning and development.
2. Identify any significant constraints or infrastructure limitations early in the planning process.
3. Ensure consistency with the HCP/NCCP
4. Plan all necessary transportation facilities, with an emphasis on transit facilities and operations.
5. Provide a plan compatible with the De La Salle and Placer Vineyards Specific Plans, as well as agricultural and environmental uses located to the north and west.
6. Respect the City of Roseville's westerly open space buffer.
7. Consider higher densities than previously found in the region.

8. Address phasing of infrastructure and a logical pattern of development.
9. Achieve a development pattern and phasing program that is fiscally sound and balanced.

Fiscal considerations: Although no detailed budget needs have been determined, based on previous efforts, the availability of a significant amount of resource information about the area, the lack of any available infrastructure, thus the need for in-depth studies in this area; it is estimated that the project would cost between \$500,000 and \$750,000, phased over a three year period. An option for funding the effort is a County general fund allocation as a part of the 04-05 fiscal year budget. Some portion of that cost could be recouped from future development as authorized by state law, or could be funded by existing landowners in the area. If the effort is to proceed, staff time would need to be budgeted within the land development departments, APCD, County Counsel, CEO, and the BOS offices.

Initial investigation: Because of the Board's direction to consider such an effort, some initial work is underway.

The staff is working with PCWA to refine and check previous water budgeting data, investigating with Roseville and Lincoln the availability of reclaimed water, analyzing the savings that could result from additional conservation methods, and looking into alternative sources of surface water.

The County is contracting with a traffic consultant to address long-term transportation needs and opportunities that could guide the development of plans for the area.

The HCP/NCCP alternatives have been developed to encompass the possibility of development in the Curry Creek Plan area. Discussions with state and federal resource agencies have included the possibility of such a plan.

The review and discussions regarding the De La Salle project have also considered possible additional development to the north and south of that project.

Request for direction: Should the Board decide that they have sufficient information to provide direction to staff on this issue, responses to the following questions would provide that direction.

1. Does the Board wish the staff to initiate the preparation of a Curry Creek Community Plan?
2. Should the land development departments and County Executive's Office further develop a budget, schedule, and funding proposal for the Board's consideration with the 04-05 fiscal year budget?
3. Is the proposed boundary an appropriate study area for a Curry Creek Community Plan?
4. Are the preliminary concepts on target for such a study?
5. Should the County not entertain new major development proposals, outside the new community plan area, or in designated agricultural areas?

PLACER RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN

The Placer Ranch Specific Plan project is proposed on 2200 acres located on both sides of Fiddymont Road, north of the City of Roseville, west of the Sunset Industrial Area, and south of the Western Placer Regional Landfill. The project proposed 5000+/- residential units, 200 acres of commercial use, 200 acres of office uses, 550 acres of industrial uses, a 240 acre public university campus, 105 acres of open space, and additional roadways, schools and infrastructure.

The County and Placer Ranch applicants have entered into a contract with Northfork Associates to complete a pre-EIR constraints analysis and assist in the development of the Placer Ranch Specific Plan. Their assigned tasks include project management, review of background information and documents, peer review of applicant-prepared studies (drainage, water, wastewater, geotechnical, Phase 1 environmental, biology and dry utilities), preparation of new studies (traffic, cultural, fiscal), resolution of critical issues and review of the Specific Plan to be developed by the applicant.

Before embarking on new studies it was determined appropriate for the County to work with the applicant in terms of exploring alternative project components and design. There have been numerous meetings involving the County, the applicant, and the consultants to evaluate and seek revisions to the draft land use map. The County encouraged the applicant to reduce the amount of housing, particularly within one mile of the landfill, and recommended that the university be moved to the western edge of the site. Numerous draft maps have been produced, however the latest version is fairly similar to the one presented to the Board of Supervisors in October. As a result of these extended discussions, the Kick-Off meeting for the preparation of new studies did not occur until April 7, 2004. The Work Program and schedule envision a six-month timeframe from the beginning of the studies to preparation of the Draft Specific Plan for submittal, which would conclude in October of 2004. The applicant is again revising the draft land use map, however, which could result in a longer period of study. Furthermore, the applicant must complete all the studies they will be submitting to Northfork Associates for peer review. Therefore, the timing of the submittal of the formal Specific Plan application has not yet been determined.

From the County's perspective, the goal was to seek a Draft Plan that would be as consistent as possible with the General Plan and Sunset Industrial Area Plan as well as implement Board direction from the October 20, 2003 meeting. Therefore, staff sought to substantially reduce residential uses, particularly those proposed within one mile of the landfill and expansion area. Staff also encouraged increases in higher density housing units and decreasing or eliminating lower density housing since so much of that type is available nearby in Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. In addition, staff recommended that the applicant consider locating the campus to the far west portion of the site. This would place it further from the landfill and would make a logical outside boundary beyond which additional urban development would not be considered. It would also be considered a better neighbor to agricultural uses and it would be easier to make the necessary findings to cancel the Ag. Preserve/Williamson Act contract. Such an alternative would also allow for possible expansion of the university site in the future.

Other recommendations included placing the University Commercial Center where it would be close to the campus and easily accessible to major roadways.

The applicant indicated a willingness to consider alternate project designs. However, they have not reduced the amount of housing, or increase the distance of that housing from the landfill. At the time of the October 20 Board meeting, 4794 residential units were proposed; the latest draft presented to staff contains 5112 residential units. In the October 20 plan, 2610 (54%) were single family residential. In the latest plan, 2514 (49%) are single family residential. Staff supports the increased proportion of higher density housing, but is still recommending a reduction in single family housing, particularly within the one mile buffer from the landfill. It is important to note that the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA) continues to be concerned about incompatible development impacting the viability and longevity of both the landfill and associated uses of this important regional facility. This includes siting the Campus within the buffer area. At this time the Authority is consulting with member agencies prior to considering a formal response and Authority staff have participated in the ongoing meetings conducted by the Planning Department relative to the processing of this application.

In terms of providing a buffer along the western edge of the project site, to the agriculturally zoned land to the west, the current plan is an improvement in that it shows a 400 foot buffer (34 acres) as well as a larger retention basin in the southwest corner. However, as indicated above, County staff continues to be concerned about locating housing and the campus within the one-mile buffer, and relatively close to the landfill expansion area as currently proposed. The staff continues to recommend that the campus and open space be located on the western side of the project. It appears that staff and the applicant are reaching a point where we will agree to disagree and move on with the project into the pre-EIR study phase. Other alternatives will be considered during the EIR process.

One other issue has arisen with regard to the Placer Ranch project design. As currently proposed, the water and sewer lines will be sized to preclude extension to the west in order to avoid growth-inducing impacts. In addition, arterial roadways are located within the project, but will not extend to the west. The property owner to the west is now proposing a major urban development which would require extension of sewer and water lines as well as roadways. This would require major revisions to the assumptions to be studied during the pre-EIR and EIR phases of the Placer Ranch project. It is important to determine very soon whether this is likely to occur, so that the Placer Ranch studies can move forward.

Board Direction Requested: Should the Placer Ranch project move forward with the assumption that water and sewer lines should be sized to preclude westward extension and without roads extending to the western edge to accommodate development to the west?

DE LA SALLE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

The De La Salle University and Community is proposed on 1100 acres to the west of the West Roseville Specific Plan area, south of Pleasant Grove Creek, east of Brewer Road, and approximately 3 miles north of Baseline Road. The proposed project includes 2350+/- residential units, 73 acres of commercial uses, a 600 acre campus, 20 acres of open space, plus schools, parks, and infrastructure.

The County has entered into a contract with EIP Associates to begin a pre-EIR analysis and assist with evaluating and refining the De La Salle Specific Plan. The consultants assigned tasks include project management, review of background information and documents, peer review of applicant-prepared studies (preliminary traffic analysis, Water Master Plan, Sewer Master Plan,

Drainage Master Plan, Public Facilities Master Plan, Biological Resources) updates as necessary, and preparation of a Market Analysis and Initial Transportation Analysis, resolution of critical issues and evaluation of the De La Salle Specific Plan including an initial Environmental Scan. The three party contract between the County, applicant and consultant has not yet been fully executed as of the date of this report.

Similar to the Placer Ranch project, the County has been working with the applicant to explore alternative project locations and project design. There have been numerous meetings involving the County, the applicant, and the consultants to evaluate and seek revisions to the draft land use map. These discussions have been ongoing but the applicant has made no substantial revisions and has moved forward with the preparation of the specific plan documents. They submitted a Draft Specific Plan on February 23, 2004, and the County's initial comments were provided to the applicant at the beginning of April. The tentative schedule for the pre-EIR and EIR process, as proposed, is approximately two years, beginning October of 2003, although the applicant did not submit a Specific Plan document until February of 2004. This schedule allows 12 months for Phase 1 (pre-EIR) which would conclude with the completed project description and refined draft Specific Plan (October 2004). Phase 2 would begin with the Notice of Preparation and end with the beginning of public hearings for the project and would take approximately 12-13 months concluding in October of 2005. This is an ambitious schedule, however the applicant is hoping to further reduce this timeframe. In an effort to move things forward as quickly as possible, the applicant has agreed to take the lead in resolving a number of project related issues. (See attachment 6.)

From the County's perspective, the goal was to seek a Draft Plan that would be as consistent as possible with the current General Plan, minimize intrusion into agricultural lands and habitat, and implement Board direction from the October 20, 2003 meeting. County staff has suggested that the Community portion of the project be relocated to the proposed expanded sphere of Roseville and the University be moved to the east adjacent to the West Roseville Specific Plan. This would limit westward expansion into the agricultural area and implement Board policy directives 1 and 3, as noted in the beginning of this report. The applicant maintains, that there were no alternative sites that property owners were willing to donate to the Christian Brothers, therefore no consideration would be given to alternate sites. Staff asked for ownership records in the area, as there appear to be other properties with the same owners nearby. As the applicant has not supplied this information, the County researched and prepared an ownership map - see attachment 7.

Within the boundaries of the project site, staff made several suggestions for revisions to road access, location of commercial areas, and density of housing. In addition, the County suggested adding a quarter-mile open space buffer along the eastern edge to mirror that proposed by the City of Roseville in the West Roseville Specific Plan and suggested that the University site plan be rearranged to allow more interaction between the campus and the Community. Minimal changes have been made to the proposed land use map in response to these recommendations.

The County's comments on the Draft Specific Plan included some suggestions for restructuring, requests for greater specificity including infrastructure phasing plans, specific editing comments and some larger issues that bear discussion here.

Affordable Housing - Project applicants propose providing as affordable 10% of the residential units (calculated by excluding on-campus student residents), or 311 units, many of them located

on the university campus. In addition, they indicate that alternatives may be allowed including construction of affordable units on another site, dedication of land to an affordable housing non-profit corporation, and payment of an in-lieu fee. It is staff's opinion that given that this project is a significant departure from the General Plan, provisions for affordable housing should be maximized. Furthermore, it does not appear appropriate to include on-campus student housing as part of the required affordable units and the specific plan should provide assurances that low, very low, and moderate income housing is constructed as a part of the project development and phased commensurate with the phasing of the project.

Water - The applicants propose to utilize groundwater on an interim basis for the project and then propose to utilize PCWA water that is anticipated to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the next few years. There are two problems with this strategy. First, General Plan policy prohibits the use of groundwater to support urban development. Further, PCWA has clearly indicated that the water to be obtained from the Sacramento River is already allocated for development that is anticipated consistent with the County General Plan. PCWA is currently studying their water budget to determine whether water conservation measures and some potential new sources of water may provide enough water to serve the De La Salle project.

Roseville Buffer - The West Roseville Specific Plan includes a quarter mile (1320 foot) open space buffer on its western edge which abuts the De La Salle site. When the WRSP was drafted, this was intended to provide a western edge and buffer to the agricultural lands to the west. Since growth is now proposed to the west in the form of the De La Salle project and potentially the Curry Creek Community Plan, a matching quarter mile buffer would provide a half mile open space separation between Roseville and the new community to the west. However, the De La Salle applicants propose to extend a major thoroughfare (extension of Watt Ave.) to be located between the WRSP and De La Salle and provide a 75 foot greenway buffer.

Program vs. Project EIR - The applicants are unable to provide the level of detail that the County's Environmental Review Ordinance requires (Section 18.04.070(A)(5) for environmental documents that include a Tentative Map. The County's Environmental Review Ordinance requires that an application must include the level of detail required by the Subdivision Ordinance. In this case, the applicants do not wish to provide small lot subdivision Tentative Maps at this time because it is intended that large lot units will be sold to developers to fund the University and the developers will want flexibility in determining the precise layout of lots they would like to sell. The Subdivision Ordinance does not appear to have anticipated "large lot" tentative subdivision maps, which is a common practice today. In addition, the California Environmental Act anticipates program level EIR's for Specific Plans, as Section 15182 of the CEQA guidelines addresses subsequent environmental reviews for projects consistent with a Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared. This would mean that when the small lot tentative maps are submitted, the County would evaluate the project to determine whether all impacts had been adequately evaluated in the Program EIR. If they are, no further environmental review would be necessary. If not, a new environmental document would need to be prepared. With the pending modification of the Subdivision Ordinance the staff will propose changes to address large lot vs. small lot tentative maps. Pending such changes, since the Subdivision Ordinances not address large lot maps, the staff will proceed as noted above with the EIR on the Specific Plan, including the ability to address large lot maps.

Recommendations:

The information in this report is presented primarily for the Board's information and as an update on the projects addressed herein. However, it is recommended that the Board provide direction relative to the Curry Creek Community Plan proposal; that the Board consider scheduling another status report/workshop discussion of the proposed west Placer major projects in December 2004, and that any additional direction regarding the Placer Ranch or De La Salle projects, prompted by this update, be provided as well.

Direction on the following 6 questions, asked earlier in the staff report, would be helpful.

1. Does the Board wish the staff to initiate the preparation of a Curry Creek Community Plan?
2. Should the land development departments and County Executive's Office further develop a budget, schedule, and funding proposal for the Board's consideration with the 04-05 fiscal year budget?
3. Is the proposed boundary an appropriate study area for a Curry Creek Community Plan?
4. Are the preliminary concepts on target for such a study?
5. Should the County not entertain new major development proposals outside the new Community Plan area, or in other designated agricultural areas?
6. Should the Placer ranch project move forward with the assumption that water and sewer lines should be sized to preclude westward extension and without roads extending to the western edge to accommodate development to the west?

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 - Minutes from 10/20/03
- Attachment 2 - Summary of direction from 10/20/03
- Attachment 3 - Copy of power point presentation 5/11/04
- Attachment 4 - Key Properties & Proposed Roadways
- Attachment 5 - Curry Creek Community Plan proposed boundary map
- Attachment 6 - Letters dated April 2, 2004, April 9, 2004 regarding DeLaSalle Project
- Attachment 7 - Placer Ranch current land use plan
- Attachment 8 - De La Salle current land use plan
- Attachment 9 - Correspondence

Respectfully submitted,



Fred Yeager, Planning Director

FKY/kh

cc: CEO

County Counsel
John Marin
DPW
DEH
Facility Services
PIO
Project applicants
EIP
NFA
BWG
Resources Law Group
Cities - Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln
Landfill Authority
DFG
USFWS
ACOE
Sacramento County
Sutter County
Diepenbrock

/may11bos3