

County of Placer

GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

8789 Auburn Folsom Blvd., Suite C-214, Granite Bay, CA 95746 County

Contact: Brian Jagger, District Director (916) 787-8950

Meeting Date and Time: March 3, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m. Meeting

Location:

Eureka Union School District Office

5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, California

1. Call to Order 7:03 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Introduction of MAC Members

A. Vice-Chairman Eric J. Teed-Bose, Virg Anderson, Tom Habashi, Walt Pekarsky, and John Thacker (Secretary).

B. Also present was Fourth District Director Brian Jagger.

4. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made (and seconded) to approve the March 2010 MAC Agenda. Approved 4-0.

5. Approval of Minutes from February 3, 2010

A motion was made (and seconded) to approve the February 2010 MAC Minutes. Approved (4-0), provided that a typographical error in the last paragraph of page 4 be corrected.

6. Public Safety Report

Bob Richardson of the South Placer Fire Department yielded his time to Ryan Bellanca regarding fire safety in view of the upcoming fire season. Mr. Bellanca is a forester and principal of the firm Bella Wildfire Services & Biomass Solutions, which is a contractor to Placer County. Mr. Bellanca noted that Granite Bay is considered a serious fire hazard area because of its concentration of both population and dry wood. He emphasized the need in such areas for intelligent “fuels removal”, such as that in which he is currently engaged in Walden Woods. Mr. Bellanca also mentioned that his firm works with fire safe

councils, which open communities up to funding sources for fuels removal.

Sgt. Doug Milligan of the CHP cautioned attendees that the Newcastle office has received a grant for speed enforcement, thus, “a word to the wise”. The grant runs through September. He emphasized that the CHP’s interest in speed enforcement derives from the clear and direct correlation observable between high speed and serious injury. Sgt. Milligan briefly discussed the difference between radar, and lidar systems, which use light, and can thus be better directed at individual vehicles.

7. Public Comment

A long-time resident and regular MAC meeting attendee announced the performance at Roseville’s Magic Circle Theater of a show called “The Interviews”, written by none other than Fourth District Director Brian Jagger.

8. Supervisor Uhler’s Report.

Mr. Jagger reported on behalf of the absent Supervisor Uhler that it is 27 degrees in Des Moines, Iowa, where Mr. Uhler is traveling on business. A long-time resident asked Mr. Jagger for a clarification with respect to Mr. Uhler’s position on both spot zoning, and new commercial construction on Douglas Boulevard. Mr. Jagger deferred discussion on these issues to discussion of agenda item 10A.

9. MAC Committee Reports

No Committee Reports

10. Informational Non-Action Items –

A. Update on Granite Bay Community Plan Review E.J. Ivaldi of the Planning Department presented regarding the Granite Bay Community Plan Review, including information on the community surveys and the overall planning process. Planning staff has not as yet made any recommendations, and the Planning Commission has not been asked to take any action. Thus, the process remains in the information gathering stage.

With respect to the surveys, Mr. Ivaldi confirmed that a total of 244 forms were received by the time a deadline was enforced. Currently, Planning Dept. staff is nearly finished tabulating both the check marks and written

comments. These include approximately 1000 comments on “goals and policies”, and nearly 4000 individual comments on land use change. Thus this is a time consuming process.

Planning staff has also initiated individual meetings with property owners to clarify ambiguous or questionable requests. After some of these meetings, property owners have withdrawn requests having agreed that they were not appropriate to Community Plan review process.

Mr. Ivaldi noted that there is no question that the community is in support of goals and policies as expressed in the current plan.

The next steps for Planning Dept. staff will be to finalize their tabulation of survey results. When this task is complete staff will post the results on its web site and report back to the MAC. Also, Planning must “check-in” with the Board of Supervisors. This would occur in April at the earliest.

Mr. Anderson inquired whether Supervisor Uhler has given any direction or indication in regard to what he might want to see from the process. Mr. Ivaldi responded in the negative. The only communication from Supervisor Uhler has been to emphasize the importance of completing the survey “tabulation”.

Mr. Habashi inquired whether there is a schedule extant in any concrete form with respect to the Community Plan review process. Mr. Ivaldi said he expects that such will be developed once Planning has had its “check-in” with the Board of Supervisors. Planning Dept. staff expects the Board of Supervisors to offer direction in light of the findings presented. He did note, however, that in view of the numerous meetings involved, the process would likely require more time than originally anticipated.

Mr. Jagger inquired whether the Planning Dept. could post on its web site a simple guide regarding next steps, time lines, etc. Mr. Ivaldi indicated that he would do so. Mr. Teed-Bose asked when Mr. Ivaldi would make his next appearance before the MAC. Mr. Ivaldi responded that such would likely occur in either April or May, but in any case he will do so with the results of the survey tabulations before the “check-in” with the Supervisors, if at all possible. Mr. Anderson then confirmed with Mr. Ivaldi that Planning would post a summary of the survey tabulations on their web site.

A long-time resident pointed out that one developer appeared to take twenty surveys from a community meeting. He is concerned that survey tabulations might be skewed by submission of multiple survey responses by single responders. This resident also indicated an interest in Supervisor Uhler's current position regarding both spot zoning and new commercial development along Douglas Boulevard.

Another long-time resident inquired whether, in light of survey responses indicating satisfaction with current goals and policies, it would be possible to terminate the review process forthwith.

Another long-time resident asked Mr. Jagger if he could send a community-wide e-mail communication once Planning Dept. staff has completed its survey tabulations. She also expressed curiosity as to Supervisor Uhler's role in the review process in the near term (i.e., before the final adoption or rejection stage). She also shared the idea of setting up a bus tour for people to see the areas that are particularly of interest in the process ("request areas"). Perhaps a fee could be charged for a tour to offset its cost.

A resident of Itchy Acres inquired concerning the budgeting for the review process. That is, how much has been spent to date, how much of the allocation remains, etc.

Another long-time resident expressed empathy for Planning Dept. staff, in light of her experience reviewing survey comments independently. She affirmed Mr. Ivaldi's assertion that the process of tabulating survey results, particularly the comments, is quite arduous. Nevertheless, she expressed concern that residents might lose control of the review process. Specifically, she is concerned that residents cannot know just what information the Board of Supervisors receives, and thus cannot accurately judge how the Supervisors are responding.

Another resident reiterated his oft-expressed concern about outreach, i.e., notification of residents of developments regarding the Community Plan review process.

Another long-time resident expressed concern about the process of meetings with individual owners. He seeks assurance that any discussion that might occur in such meetings, which is appropriate for public dissemination, not be kept confidential.

Mr. Jagger addressed the spot zoning issue. He asserted that Supervisor Uhler specifically desires to use the Community Plan review process as a means of allowing people to make their zoning requests via this process, thus allowing the community as a whole an opportunity to weigh in. Mr. Jagger also stated that Supervisor Uhler supports the proposed 23,000-person population cap. Additionally, he will not vote to support any changes such as will add commercial zoning to Douglas Boulevard.

Regarding the review process, Mr. Jagger reiterated that policies would be discussed first. Further, a vote will occur on policies before anything is done on land use. Regarding the tour notion, Mr. Jagger opined that such might be premature because it is highly likely the policy-first approach will eliminate some properties from potential land use changes. Addressing concerns that the “check-in” Planning Dept. staff will have with the Board of Supervisors might result in zoning changes, Mr. Jagger offered that such could not occur because by state law re-zones are limited to four per year and must be placed as separate items on the agenda.

Regarding “irregularities” in survey comment submissions, Mr. Ivaldi responded that Planning Dept. staff is attuned to this possibility, because they want to get the best information possible regarding community attitudes. They will address any “irregularities” they find in the context of their findings. All survey forms returned indicate a name and address from Granite Bay, with a single exception (from Loomis).

Regarding the suggestion that the review process be terminated, Mr. Ivaldi noted that this is a political question within the Board’s bailiwick. There is no reason why community members may not appear and petition the Board to this or any end. The role of the Planning Department is simply to ask the Board “how do we proceed”.

Regarding the notification/outreach question, Mr. Ivaldi adds that there will be additional efforts, however he is not certain exactly what form such will take. He noted that the Planning Department’s mailing list is getting longer and longer. Nevertheless, they are open to additional ideas.

Regarding the concern about private meetings with proponents of zoning changes, Mr. Ivaldi stated that the purpose of these meetings is to define what these folks want, and determine whether the Community Plan review

process is the appropriate avenue for their goals. In effect, the meetings serve a process of elimination *vis-à-vis* zoning change requests.

With respect to budgeting for the Community Plan review process, the Planning Department has within its annual budget a fund for plan reviews, generally. There is no specific amount is assigned to Granite Bay, or any other of the 14 Community Plan areas.

Mr. Habashi inquired whether wildfire protection is a subject of the Community Plan. This was the subject of many comments in the returned surveys. This matter certainly could be included in a policy discussion. About the bus tour, Mr. Habashi says the idea may be unfeasible, but MAC members should nevertheless undertake such a field trip.

Mr. Anderson asked about the “check-in” with the Supervisors. “Direction” from the Board would be an action item on their agenda. Recall that the Board has broad authority regarding Planning Department activities. Does the Planning Department give the Board of Supervisors advice? The Planning Department always provides the Board a recommendation, but such could be as simple as a request that the Board “give us direction”, which is what is likely in this instance.

Concerning community outreach relative to the review process, it should be noted that Planning Commissioner Moss has asked that any Planning Commission discussion about the Community Plan take place in Granite Bay. Supervisor Uhler supports this initiative.

B. 2010 Engineering and Traffic Survey

Based on state law, an Engineering and Traffic Survey is to be conducted on a regular basis in order to update speed limits on various roads in Placer County. Based on the study of some roadways in the Granite Bay area, some roads may have their speed limit adjusted. Phil Vassion of the Placer County Public Works department presented regarding this process, and discussed proposed speed limit changes.

The county is required by law to update traffic surveys every five years. This period which can be extended to seven years if the local CHP has licensed lidar operators on staff, and to ten years in the case of “special circumstances”. Legal lidar and radar enforcement must get approval from the Board of Supervisors. Both lidar and radar enforcement are governed by

the California manual of uniform traffic control devices, and the California Vehicle code. VC 627 sets forth specific criteria. One is a speed survey, usually done by a traffic tech with a radar gun. A second criterion is a collision records analysis, in which accident rates are calculated, and compared with similar roads statewide. A third criterion is a determination of conditions not apparent to drivers. These criteria are applied to a benchmark speed, which is the 85th percentile speed derived from the speed survey. Note that surveys may not be performed on weekdays between 7-9 a.m., and 4-6 p.m.

In this regard, CHP Sgt. Ketterer asked that a survey be performed on both East Roseville Parkway, and Olive Ranch Road, so that radar and lidar could be utilized. For both roadways, surveys were completed and supported a five mph increase, from 35 to 40mph. Mr. Vassion noted that in effect, the citizens of the community vote and establish speed limits by their driving habits. Also, he noted that the accident rates for these roads are low.

Mr. Habashi inquired whether Twin Rocks Road and Berg Street were appropriate candidates for a reduced speed limit. Their respective physical characteristics may suggest this; moreover, they can still be certified for radar and lidar enforcement.

Mr. Anderson expressed concern about Olive Ranch Road given that kids are dropped off from school buses and don't have a big shoulder to walk on. Mr. Vassion said this is the kind of peculiar situation that may warrant further investigation. However, also note that if a road is radar/lidar certified, it would invariably prove to be safer, even if the speed limit increased modestly, so this is also a consideration. Also, studies have shown that when you increase the speed limit by 5mph, the 85th percentile rises only very, very slightly, maybe a couple of tenths of one mph.

Sgt. Milligan notes that surveys are critical, because the CHP can't enforce speed limits on a road that has not been surveyed.

One long-time resident agreed with Mr. Anderson regarding Olive Ranch Road. She noted also that there are bicycle clubs that use that road; also, there are lots of private driveways, as well as many adults walking.

A long-time resident of Itchy Acres agreed that there are numerous walkers about on Olive Ranch Road where the shoulders are narrow. He expressed

puzzlement why the speed limit has been reduced on Cavitt-Stallman Road between Auburn-Folsom and Barton, though the road has been much improved.

Another resident asked for clarification regarding the role of the survey in the final speed limit decision. He noted, in regard to the “voting” metaphor, that many people from outside our community are “voting” for us.

Another long-time resident decried the rough conditions on Berg Street, and echoed the prevailing sentiment regarding safety on Olive Ranch Road.

A long-time resident commented on the conditions on or about Elmhurst Road, and specifically on the 5mph increase on East Roseville Parkway from Brackenbury. She thinks the increase is a bad idea given all the school traffic; also, and she does not think speed limit coordination with the Roseville city portion of this roadway is a good idea. She is not confident it is a good risk that people won't actually drive faster if the speed limit is increased 5mph.

Mr. Anderson back commented again on the Olive Ranch Road safety issue. He questions at what portion of the roadway the survey was taken. Mr. Vassion agreed that this is an important question, and agreed to look into it. The important factor to consider is that there are a lot of different characteristics along the length of the road.

11. Action Items - NONE

12. Correspondence – Found on Table at the rear of the room.

13. Next Meeting: GB MAC April 7, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m.

14. Adjournment: 8:46 p.m.