

RIO LINDA/ELVERTA
COMMUNITY PLANNING
ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

7:00 PM

Rio Linda Depot Visitors' Center
6730 Front Street, Rio Linda, CA 95673

<http://www.per.saccounty.net/CPAC/Pages/CPAC-RioLinda-Elverta.aspx>

NOTE: Minutes posted are drafts until approved at the following meeting by the CPAC. Corrected Minutes will be posted if changes are made.

Note: Applicant or appointed representative should be present. If unable to attend, please contact the Rio Linda CPAC Chair, Hal Morris at (916) 991-2416 or halmorris@comcast.net. The Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Review Division representatives for the Rio Linda CPAC area are Leighann Moffitt at (916) 874-5584 or moffitt@saccounty.net and Nick Pascoe at (916) 874-3103 or pascoen@saccounty.net. To contact the Planning and Environmental Review Division CPAC support, please call the CPAC Secretary at (916) 874-5397.

Note: To receive notification of Sacramento County public meetings sign up for Sac County news. Visit the following website and enter your e-mail address: <https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CASACRAM/subscriber/new?>

*Note: To receive additional information regarding Current Planning projects visit the Planning Projects Viewer website at <http://www.planningdocuments.saccounty.net/>. Select the appropriate community from the drop down field, click the search button and a list of projects will be generated. Scroll down the list until the project is located and click on it for additional information. **For direct access to information on projects in this agenda, use the link provided below the Control Number.***

Note: To submit project comments to CPAC members, email them to CPAC-RioLinda-Elverta@saccounty.net. Please identify the relevant project using the project name, control number or address.

OFFICERS:	HAL MORRIS - P	<u>CHAIR</u>
	ROY HICKEY - P	<u>VICE-CHAIR</u>
	CHARLEA MOORE - P	<u>SECRETARY</u>
MEMBERS:	RANDALL AESCHILIMAN - P	JESUS NAVARRO - EXA
REPRESENTATIVES:	LEIGHANN MOFFITT - COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	NICK PASCOE - COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

EXA – EXCUSED ABSENCE R – RESIGNED U - UNEXCUSED ABSENCE TE - TERM EXPIRED P – PRESENT

QUORUM DETERMINATION:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	No
COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	No

Matters under the jurisdiction of the CPAC and not on the posted agenda may be addressed by the general public following completion of the regular agenda. The CPAC may limit the length of any off-agenda testimony.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER: 7:03 P.M. CHAIR MORRIS

- CALL MEETING TO ORDER
- EXPLANATION OF ROLE OF THE COUNCIL
- ROLL CALL
- INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS, STAFF, AND COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES

PLANNING ITEMS FOR REVIEW: NONE**OTHER BUSINESS:****1. A WORKSHOP ON REVISIONS TO THE NORTHBOROUGH PROJECT (PLNP2013-00056) SITE PLAN THAT WAS IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE CPAC MEMBERS AND THE COMMUNITY AT PRIOR COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS.****PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Joelle Inman and Jessica Heuer from the County provided an update and indicated that this project is being brought back to the RLE CPAC for further public input and comments. This project will come back to the CPAC again after the Draft EIR is started.

Mike Winn and Bret Hogg presented for the owners group on the changes to the Northborough Project. Most significant changes were a small reduction in the total number of units; addition of a 'greenbelt/open space buffer' along the southern edge; Rifle Ridge no longer goes through with agreements from the Sheriff and Sac. Metro Fire Dept. There are two Park Sites, one School site, and the addition of some "larger" lots in the south east corner of the project. It was noted that these larger lots could be "gated" but were not at this time. There are two access entry points into Gibson Ranch County Regional Park; one at the north corner of Gibson Ranch and at the south edge of the project which is currently a field.

CPAC Comments:

Randy A. asked about the size/location of the detention pond which seemed to show an outlet to the south-west near Rifle Ridge and where would the water flow to? Which direction? The hydrology of the detention pond is engineered so that no greater-than-current downstream flow will be allowed. There will be a cement ditch between the houses at the south west corner to the proposed multi-use trail system that also is the drainage swale to conduct the flow into the drainage system. The detention pond is about 12 acres in size.

Charlea M. asked about the possible de-watering of neighboring wells and who would be responsible for making restitution or new wells? The RLE Community Water District would be responsible but the well owner would need to provide proof that the project wells were responsible for the de-watering. Discussion was about how "proof" could be accomplished. Suggestions were to have private wells adjoining the project tested once a year for flow rate and keep those records. This expense would be borne by the well owner.

Hal M. asked about the number of units in relation to the number of population at an estimated 3.0 per dwelling. This increase would require more parks space, recreation requirements and school space. It would also impact the traffic.

Joelle I. said the calculation is at 2.8 per dwelling unit. Hal M. noted that the allocated park space is in deficit by about 7 acres even not using the 3.0 per dwelling unit figures. Hal M. would like to see the inclusion of the proposed "Sports Park" that is just to the west of the Northborough Project as a factor to remedy the deficit in park acreage. Many of the influx of population would benefit from the Sports Complex being built sooner rather than later. The discussion among the CPAC included moving the trigger for the Sports Complex to a lower number of units as a condition.

Roy H. asked about the sewer line, will the Northwest Interceptor be the connection? How will the new lines go in? Suggestion that tearing up Elverta Rd. once for both widening and the sewer lines installation would be the best scenario. Roy H. is concerned that the "fees" for the parks/sports complex might be sidetracked into road improvements. Dave Wigginton, RLE Parks Administrator stated there would be a written agreement to determine when the Sports Complex will be completed.

Hal M. asked that the finance plan come back to the RLE CPAC after the amendments but before the final approval. There is concern that the CPAC and public may not see the finance amendments which may impact the community before they are approved.

Charlea M. pointed out that other cities and projects build and widen roads ahead of the "rooftops" which seems much more efficient than waiting for inevitable gridlock and congestion before beginning the widening Elverta Rd. It would make sense to widen Elverta Rd. at the same time the sewer lines are laid. The discussion was that DOT *could* ask for widening sooner if congestion is sufficient.

Public Comments:

Stephanie LaFasia: Asked about the traffic from Tan Woods north into Placer County. There are 'triggers' in the plan for the increase in traffic into Placer Co. and onto Watt Ave. Sacramento County and Placer County are working together on infrastructure issues that affect both sides. She also had a question about the "type" of fencing between Gibson Ranch and the project. It will be solid without any gates from private property into Gibson Ranch. May be wrought iron.

Linda Prichard: Worried about flooding, the detention pond is near her property. Who will hold the builders accountable? These people in front of us will not be the builders. The "Parkway" allows crime access into the area. Would like to see the "Shelbourne" at Granite Bay for Elverta. Where will the affordable housing be located? Developers will pay a fee in lieu of building units. There will be a "range" of density from about 3 units per acre to as high as 10 units in some areas.

Kayrn Lehman: Concerned about security for existing homes and property; Concerned about "water source" since there is a moratorium and there are no water lines past El Verano Ave. Concerned about traffic on 16th St. as the main ingress/egress; Concerned about existing homes on both sides of Elverta Rd. between 16th St. and Rio Linda Blvd.: Wants to retain the 'rural Elverta' lifestyle; What happened to all the Ag. Res. Lots that were supposed to be next to existing Ag. Res.? There are none left.

Ron Tarp: Concerned about a large new home being built that has no "handicap" access. He will talk with a neighbor about this issue.

Joann Kessel: Asked if this is the "first" project of the Elverta Specific Plan. Northborough is part of ESP but is going ahead on a separate track from the Elverta Specific Plan.

Linda Robbin: How wide is the 'greenbelt' Ans. 120 feet. Concerned about the "rest of the ESP" to the south: Concerned about the drainage impacts on the remaining ESP build out.

Phil Wilson: Why does the 'catch basin' extend into the 'greenbelt' on the map? Asked about wells going dry: The RLECWD will be responsible for all the water for the project. Agrees that there are insufficient parks; Worried about the traffic impacts; How will the widening of Elverta accommodate the existing homes that are very close to Elverta Rd.? Why hasn't a builder been chosen yet? Mike W. responded that the project is too large and too sophisticated and expensive for a single builder. The Elverta Rd. widening is probably going to go to the north of the existing homes and come out somewhere west of the Rio Linda Bld. but the exact route hasn't yet been determined.

Bret Albrecht: May be gone before project is done but is concerned about the road infrastructure and agrees it should be done first or at least sooner than later. Mike W. said they would have DOT present at the next update on North Borough to answer some of the road and traffic issues.

Kim Blackwell: Concerned about increased access by the 'homeless' along the greenbelt, trails and open space into the neighborhood. What kind of wall or fence will be used along the Parkway, greenbelt, trails to keep the area secure? Also concerned about the noise, kids, cars, and lights. Need to find a way to make the trail more secure and safe at night especially.

Repeat question from Phil Wilson: Wants to make sure that Rifle Ridge never go through in the future.

Chair Hal Morris closed the public comments. He announced that this project would return when the draft EIR is done.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Hal Morris moved to approve the minutes of May 28, 2014. Second by Roy Hickey. Passed 4-0-1-0

Randy A. was concerned about the Guru Ravidass Temple project because the CPAC did not set a time line for completion of the drainage culverts and improvements and if it is delayed past the winter the neighbors will have the same flood issues as before. Suggestion was for CPAC to request that prior to any permits for improvements the proponent needs to come back to the CPAC. At that time the CPAC could request that the culverts/flood improvements take place first.

Charlea M. said that she wasn't able to download any of the maps or documents from the Planning Dept. website. It will be checked out.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

CPAC Member forwarding minutes to County Planning and Environmental Review Division:

Charlea Moore

The meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for interpreting services, assistive listening devices, or other considerations should be made through the County Planning and Environmental Review Division at (916) 874-5397 or 874-7647 (TTY), no later than five working days prior to the meeting. California Relay Service (CRS) is a third party interpretation service for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and/or speech-impaired persons. CRS can be reached by dialing 711 or 1-800-735-2929



**YOUR LINK
TO COUNTY SERVICES
ONLINE, OR ON THE GO!**

www.311.SacCounty.net | Dial 3-1-1

Outside unincorporated Sacramento County

Dial 916-875-4311