
GRANITE BAY MAC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 1, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

Eureka School District Office, Board Room, 5477 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1. Call to Order 7:00 PM

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Suzanne Jones asked Eric Bose to lead the pledge.

3. Introduction of MAC Members and Secretary

Suzanne Jones, Bill Bowen, Virg Anderson, Barbara Singletary, Eric Bose and Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary. Barbara Singletary was introduced as the new Member of the MAC. Te Iwi Boyd was introduced as the new MAC Secretary.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Motion was made to approve the agenda. Motion seconded and passed, 6-0.

5. Approval of the Minutes

a. March 4, 2015

Virg Anderson brought to the MAC's attention, comments made by Supervisor Uhler at the last meeting regarding the Granite Bay Community Plan Rezoning and the variances were not included in the minutes. Additionally, comments regarding screening and residents to the north and the need to start an open dialog, establishing expectations needs to be done. Linda Brown has the notes and will make the necessary corrections.

6. Public Safety Reports

a. Placer County Sheriff

There has been an increase in mail tampering and I.D. theft, people filing fraudulent tax returns. There have recently been four (4) reported break-ins at the mailboxes located in the Fern Hill, West Lake and Hidden Lake Estates areas. The Sheriff's Department is asking you to be vigilant and watch your accounts for any suspicious activities. Mail delivers are watching for followers.

There has been no increase in burglary or door kicks that previously occurred.

7. Public Comments: Any member of the public may address the Municipal Advisory Council on any matter that is NOT listed on the agenda. Comments will normally be limited to three (3) minutes per person at the discretion of the Chairperson.

Sandy Harris, a community member, reminded all those in attendance that the Pond Pavilion project would be going before the Planning Commission on April 9, 2015 at 10:40 AM in Auburn.

8. Supervisor Report (If Supervisor Kirk Uhler is not present, Linda Brown will present)

Linda Brown reported that Supervisor Jennifer Montgomery is among 24 women elected officials nationwide recognized this year by a new program created to highlight outstanding contributions by women in government.

Supervisor Montgomery is one of two elected officials from California and one of only three county supervisors from throughout the U.S. recognized by the program.

The 24 women are serving as the inaugural class of a Women in Government Leadership Program created by the Governing Institute, a three-year-old initiative focused on improving the performance of state and local governments and strengthening public-sector innovation, leadership and citizen engagement.

Placer County Executive Officer David Boesch was presented the Public Servant of the Year Award at the North Lake Tahoe 61st Annual Community Awards Dinner. The award is given to a citizen nominated for his or her service in the categories of: education, special representative, fire or local government. The award ceremony is sponsored by the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. The event, held at the Resort at Squaw Creek, was attended by about 200 people.

Boesch was honored for his level of involvement and commitment to the Tahoe community. He was also applauded for Placer County's efforts to improve economic development efforts in the North Lake Tahoe area.

For the third consecutive year, Placer County has ranked as the second healthiest county among California's 58 counties. The ranking is an annual project of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin.

The project looks at 30 factors in developing its rankings. These factors are broken into categories and statewide, Placer County ranked first in quality of life, second in health factors, health behaviors and social and economic factors and third in clinical care. Other categories include length of life and physical environment.

In past reports, Placer County has been ranked in the top 10 of each of the last five years.

Placer County is laying the groundwork for a new project in its award-winning campaign to reduce the frequency and severity of traffic collisions on county roads.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors voted unanimously Tuesday to approve a \$57,621 contract with Central Striping Service Inc. to install recessed reflective pavement markers on five county roads: Bowman, Dry Creek, Horseshoe Bar, Lake Arthur and West Weimar Cross Road.

The pavement markers will be installed on both sides of centerlines to help prevent head-on collisions. A grant from the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program will provide 90 percent of the funding and county road funds will cover the remaining 10 percent.

The 24th Annual Placer County Economic Development Summit announced this year's outlook is favorable for the Sacramento region and Placer County is well-positioned to benefit.

"Placer County is uniquely situated within the larger Sacramento region in many ways", Sanjay Varshney told the crowd, noting that the county has a business-friendly reputation, a relatively small population base, a great natural environment and higher-than-average per-capital income.

This year's economic summit breakfast was held at the Blue Goose Event Center in Loomis. The theme was "Experience Placer Life".

The Economic Development Board (EDB) presented awards to recognize two career-training programs, four businesses and a Roseville public-private partnership for their contributions to the county's economic well-being during 2014.

The Agriculture Department at Lincoln High School won one of the two public sector awards for career training programs. County Agricultural Commissioner Josh Huntsinger nominated the program.

The other public sector award went to an innovative job-training program designed to transition young adults from low-wage, low-skilled occupations to in-demand construction trade jobs.

The other award winners are: Energy Saving Pros of Loomis; Quest Data Center of Roseville; Riskalyze Inc. of Auburn; Kim's Country Kitchen in Lincoln; and Advantage Roseville.

The EDB is an advisory board that assists the county with its business attraction and retention efforts. It promotes the creation of new jobs and tax revenue and supports tourism, agribusiness, film production and workforce development initiatives.

Placer County officials hailed the news that a prominent real estate investment company acquired an industrial building in the Sunset Industrial Area (SIA) recently and was able to simultaneously lease most of the space to Volkswagen of America.

County officials emphasized the simultaneous transactions involving Westcore and Volkswagen are signs of growing demand for space in the SIA, a county-created industrial part that covers approximately 8,100 acres of unincorporated land located west of Highway 65 between the cities of Rocklin, Roseville and Lincoln.

The Placer County Youth Impact Awards is a new platform on which to recognize Placer teens for their hard work and contributions to the community. The Placer County Youth Commission created the awards because students felt there was a lack of awareness and recognition of youth service and perseverance. "Youth are creating positive change yet youth service and youth resilience isn't acknowledged like academics or athletics", said Youth Awards Chair Tyler Tate. "These awards can bring recognition to those who deserve it the most."

To participate in the Youth Impact Awards, students complete an online application available by going to <http://www.placer.ca.gov/news>. Deadline for submissions is at midnight on April 6, 2015. Each category will have one \$100 award recipient, yet all applicants will receive recognition at a celebration dessert on Sun. April 26th at 7 p.m. at the Woodcreek Golf Course Clubhouse, 5880 Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, Roseville.

An ambitious project to increase the vertical clearance of nine overcrossings over Interstate 80 through Placer County is on time according to an updated presented to the Board of Supervisors. Liza Whitmore, a representative for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provided the information, giving details about the status of the Raise80 project.

Of the nine projects, four have been completed. All of those have involved lifting the overcrossings to the necessary distance to achieve the federally-mandate clearance of 16 feet 6 inches.

During the lifting phase of each overcrossing, the interstate will be closed overnight for two consecutive days from 11 p.m. until 5 a.m. the next morning. The roads over the actual overpasses will be closed about two to three weeks as Caltrans builds up the approaches and performs improvements.

The Horseshoe Bar Road overcrossing in Loomis will be the next overcrossing to be lifted. Initial work has already begun and the lifting, with requisite interstate closing is scheduled for April 14 and 15. To stay informed about work schedules and road closures, join the project's social media sites:

Project Alerts E-blast Sign up at www.raise80.com

Text: "Raise80" to 20673

9. Informational Items/Non-Action:

The Middle Fork Project - Overview: Presented by: Brett Storey, Senior Management Analyst, Placer County Planning Department

The Middle Fork Project (MFP) is a multi-purpose water supply and hydro-generation project designed to conserve and control waters of the Middle Fork American River, the Rubicon River, and several associated tributary streams in order to meet municipal, industrial, and agricultural demands within western Placer County, to provide recreational experiences, to contribute to the natural resource preservation and enhancement of the river and to generate power for the California electrical grid. In 2006, the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and the County of Placer entered in to a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) in order to obtain a new Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license to approve Future Electrical Energy Sales, fund the necessary operational costs and to distribute revenues from Future Electrical Energy Sales to both PCWA and Placer County. The presentation will provide an overview of the project, the re-license process and the policies (financial, administrative and operational) and potential revenues involved. Get a more detailed description of the project at <http://www.placer.ca.gov/projects/middle-fork-project>.

This project was initiated because water was not stored until the 60's. At that time PG&E held the paid debt service contract. On April 30, 2013 the contract for these services went back to PCWA. No funding was left. In 2006, a JPA was formed subject to FERC relicensing proceedings, technical studies, plans and upgrades. At that time \$85M was borrowed with the obligation to pay back the project operations transitioned to the JPA on May 1, 2013. The JPA includes two members from Placer County and two members from PCWA. The JPA's role is to adopted policies and oversee revenue distributions. Revenue distributions can only be made after the first 2 years and all reserves are and operational costs have been addressed.

Reservoirs that make up this project include French Meadows and Hell Hole. There are many miles of tunnels and several power houses. This water flows to Folsom lake. This system was built to withstand time. Although the infrastructure is in good shape, parts are difficult to find, making repairs a costly and time prohibitive process.

County related services in the MFP project area consist of additional Sheriff operations and equipment; funding for fire Operations, CDF and Forest Hill Fire Protection District; Road Contributions; Communication upgrades and a Fuel reduction program (started in 2014).

The license is expected to be approved in 2016/17 and requires the JPA to: Build new infrastructure; Monitor/protect species; and to Alter flows for species and recreation.

As with any project, there are unanticipated project impacts such as the King Fire. That fire left the Rubicon forest area devastated leaving behind the potential for hillsides/debris sliding into river and project facilities. PG&E power lines were burned and replaced (PGE Performed); it required preparation for logs, silt, rocks to be flowing in the water. There were systems that had to be put in place to keep the systems running and treating the water properly. The estimation of cost to MFP is \$2-\$10M over next few years - MFP is working with the Department of Forestry, and the Federal Government to cover some of these costs.

MFP is exceptional at operations but relies on two major impacts that have annual volatility:

- Hydrology - Rain and Snow
- Power Price - Market conditions (driven by supply and demand - low natural gas price and demand - conservation etc. side markets)

Case in Point: Since taking over operations

- 2013 Drought, lower prices operational costs met, little for reserves
- 2014 Drought & King Fire prices better, operational cost met
- 2015 Drought: prices dropping, operational costs likely met, little to no reserves
- 2016 likely set up in license costs

A table of the MFP Volatility Natural Water Flow & Record Generation was shown.

Placer County adopted a Revenue Distribution Annually policy in June 2014. Requiring that MFP operations and costs, including license requirements, to be fully funded. At the time that the reserves are fully funded, then the JPA can release funds for distribution. The distribution structure is to be 25% County/25% PCWA/50% debt pre-payment.

To promote financial stability and long-term planning as with the receipt and expenditure of the county's share of annual MFP net revenues and to stabilize the highly volatile revenues, County funds are placed into a MFP Trust fund which will be used for future capital and infrastructure.

Vicki Sackstader, community member asked Mr. Storey if he could clarify what if any additional recreational activities this project could create and who would be responsible for providing services associated with the additional recreational activities. Mr. Storey clarified that this would fall under Federal property and would be run by state parks. They are anticipating more of the same type of recreation/campgrounds and that they would not require any additional staff.

Arlene Keely, community member wanted to know the justification of price for energy, alternative energy, and wanted to know if there is not enough water, is it conflicting with solar? Mr. Storey explained that solar and wind are subsidized. Even solar pays for alternative energy after they drop off (after 5pm). The MFP does not sell to constituents. They are selling to the open market.

Patricia McKinney, community member wanted to know if water was designated for Western Placer County? Mr. Storey explained that yes, in general, this water flows almost exclusively into Folsom Lake using the Drum Spalding system and reminded her that pumping water is very expensive. Ms. McKinney also asked what happens when there is no water. Mr. Storey reminded everyone that conservation is very important. Folsom Lake is in a much better situation than most other reservoirs, whereas, New Malone's Reservoir is at its lowest level in history.

For more information on the Middle Fork Project, go to:
www.placer.ca.gov/projects/middle-fork-project

10. Action Items:

The Grove at Granite Bay Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit Modification:

Presented by: Sherri Conway, Senior Planner, Placer County Planning Services Division

The project, the Grove at Granite Bay, is located on the west side of Berg Street, south of Olive Ranch Road and north of Douglas Boulevard, in the Granite Bay area. The applicant is seeking a modification to the Conditional Use Permit for The Grove at Granite Bay (PSGC 2004-0294) regarding the setback requirements on several lots.

Specific to six (6) specific lots that are bordered by Berg Street to the **east** (APNs : 460-260-001, 460-260-008, 460-260-009, 460-270-002, 460-270-009, 460-280-009) , the applicant is requesting to modify the following Conditions of Approval:

- 82: Notification to future owners of Lots 1, 8, 9, 24, 25, and 32 that solid fencing on any type is prohibited within the "front" setback along Berg Street.

- 85. Notification to the future owners that no structures, including solid fencing over 3' in heights may be installed in front setback areas, including any property frontages along roadways.
- 97. Other than approved entry features, solid walls, solid wood fencing, and any other solid features are prohibited along the Berg Street and Olive Ranch Road frontages. Open fencing (i.e. wrought iron) is allowed, subject to review and approval by the DRC.

The project was approved to include a 30-foot landscaped corridor from the edge of the easement of Berg Street, in addition to a 25-foot landscape easement, and a building setback requirement of 50 feet from the property line. The applicant is requesting the modification to allow property owners the option to construct full or partial solid fencing at the edge of the 25-foot landscape easement to allow for greater privacy in the backyards of these lots that front on Berg Street. The required 50-foot building setback from the project boundary would remain unchanged.

Additionally, the applicant is requesting to modify the following Condition:

- 12 – Show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year flood plain (after grading) for the on-site marsh and wetland areas on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Map(s) and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein. Show a 30' rear setback line for Lots 10 and 11 due to the close proximity of the 100-year post-development ponding limit.

Ms Conway, reported that The Grove at Granite Bay is a Planned Development approved in 2004. This project was placed on hold because of the recession and now that the economy is picking up they are moving forward with the development and the lots for this project are being purchased and homes are being built.

The original developer for the project was present as well as representatives for The New Home Company. Ms. Conway provided MAC members and members of the community a site map of the project for their reference.

Ms. Conway also reported that the previously agreed upon 30ft. landscaped corridor, consisting of plantings and a meandering sidewalk have been built prior to the project beginning construction; that the additional 25ft. landscape easement is in place and consists of a number of olive and oak trees to provide natural screening and some privacy to the six (6) lots that front Berg Street and that the 50ft. structural set back is being maintained.

However, as construction of these lots begins, developers/new property owners are finding discrepancies caused by the unusual size of the lots and the fact that the backyards of these homes face Berg, causing the developer to come back to the Granite Bay MAC to discuss the possibility of erecting some type of privacy screening (wall, fence, something similar) for these specific lots.

Ms. Conway showed several photos of the lots and what the residents/developers are looking at.

Because this project is a planned community, the developer thought it would be beneficial for all parties to address this issue as a Conditional Use Permit Modification rather than as a series of variances. In addition to the 6 lots mentioned earlier, lots, 10, 11 and 12 are allowed for a 30ft set back to allow for 100 yr flood zone. These lots have constraints, because of their unusual lot size and are therefore asking for a reduction from 30ft to 10 ft or 15ft whichever is more restrictive and to reduce the front setback from 35ft to 25ft so that the houses will fit on the lots and allow the homeowner some usable yard area.

MAC Member Virg Anderson started off the question portion of this item by stating that when the MAC originally met on this item, the concern was that the east side of Berg street has front yards facing Berg, but the west side of Berg Street has backyards facing out onto Berg Street and the neighbors wanted to avoid having a "tunnel effect" when driving down Berg Street. Member Anderson stated that he was ok with the request regarding Lots 10, 11 and 12, but he has a problem with the other lots and modifying the Conditional Use Permit as it is currently written.

Member Eric Bose requested clarification on the placement of the fence for Lots 10, 11 and 12. The New Home Company representative clarified the fencing placement and explained that they are putting their smallest floorplan on these lots and the current setback does not allow for any yard. The New Home Company also clarified that this issue is not a flood related issue but it is a buildability issue that the contour lines remain near the same since the original inception of the project. The New Home Company did not and was not allowed to touch that area. HOA fencing (opening fencing) is already in place.

Member Bose expressed his support and thinks the request for modification regarding Lots 10, 11 and 12 is a reasonable request.

The New Home Company explained that they are requesting homeowners be allowed to construct a partial wall/fence to provide privacy for pool areas, they are not asking to construct an entire wall/fence. Looking for a "happy medium".

MAC Members asked what would keep these owners from coming in and placing solid fencing. The New Home Company said there isn't anything preventing homeowners from constructing solid wood fencing, however that would require HOA approval.

Member Anderson pointed out that the existing plantings and vegetation will continue to mature and feels it will provide the privacy screening The New Home Company is looking for.

Barbara Singletary asked The New Home Company to explain how they planned to address the 5 foot rule that the State has regarding pools. The New Home Company offers netting as fall protection. However, the County will require a 5ft fence around the property, not necessarily the pool, to prevent access.

Arlene Keely, a resident on Berg Street circulated copies of the section of the Conditional Use Permit that was being discussed as well as a copy of her notes to the MAC Members and the audience. Ms. Keely has lived here since 1994. She explained that the original plans were for homes to be built so that the front yard faced Berg Street so that their neighborhood would continue looking like a neighborhood. Then at some point in the process, the homes were turned and now those 6 lots have backyards facing Berg. She

was unaware of the size of the homes that were to go into this development. She and her neighbors requested there be no solid fencing along Berg at all. That request was incorporated into the Conditional Use Permit. Ms. Keely is looking for mature trees for screening instead of fencing and requests that conditions be upheld. Ms. Keely feels that you don't need a fence for screening. She feels fencing is being considered because it is an "easy" fix and she concluded with pointing out that other subdivision have open fencing.

Another neighbor on Berg Street wanted to remind everyone that Berg Street is designated as a country road and encouraged everyone to look at page 60 of the Community Plan. She doesn't understand why they are not talking to a landscape architect for other options.

Member Jones stated she was concerned about including the entire subdivision in this modification.

Sandy Harris, expressed her appreciation of the trail and said a good job was done with the landscaping and she is impressed with the outcome.

Monica Sandgatha, a neighbor on Berg Street, pointed out that the language states The New Home Company is requesting a full fence. A representative from The New Home Company clarified that they are only looking for partial fencing.

Suzanne Jones asked The New Home Company to confirm the height of the fencing. The New Home Company confirmed 6 feet.

Dale Munson, community resident, wanted to share with everyone that the last time he was in Hollywood taking a tour of the homes of the stars, he didn't see solid fencing, and he saw the use of solid hedges used for privacy screening. He thinks you could end up with that.

Member Anderson stated that he felt it was important to maintain the promise previously made to the neighbors.

This project is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on April 23rd.

Susanne Jones closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Member Anderson suggested to the MAC make 2 motions. The first motion to cover Lots 10, 11 and 12 and the second to cover the 6 lots on Berg Street.

Member Eric Bose made a motion that recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed modification for lots 10, 11 &12. Motion seconded.

Roll Call:

Eric Bose - aye

Barbara Singleterry - aye

Suzanne Jones - aye

Virg Anderson - aye

Bill Bowen – aye

Motion passed, 5-0.

2nd Part: 6 lots on Berg

Member Eric Bose made a motion to recommend denial of the modification for the 6 lots along Berg Street based on issues being able to be mitigated with landscaping. The MAC feels they need to stick with their original agreement with the neighbors. West Side of Berg looks great, they would like to maintain the uniform landscape. Motion seconded.

Roll Call:

Eric Bose - aye

Barbara Singleterry - aye

Suzanne Jones - aye

Virg Anderson - aye

Bill Bowen – aye

Motion passed, 5-0.

- **Correspondence – Found on Table at the rear of the room.**
- **Next Regular Meeting – May 6, 2015**
- **ADJOURNMENT 9:00PM**