

Rancho Murieta North Stakeholder Group Meeting #2

Rancho Murieta Community
Service District Office
15160 Jackson Road,
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683

June 23, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

1. INTRODUCTION

- A. Review of Draft 6/3 Meeting Minutes
 - 1. No comment on notes, 6/3 notes accepted as “final”
- B. Review of Meeting Agenda and Approach
 - 1. Surinder explain agenda. Mike Robertson to give presentation and then general discussion
 - 2. Can there be additional comments from the County if the stakeholders are interested?
 - a. County resources available to answer any questions we might have, DOT and DWR in attendance
 - b. No other comments

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT AREA RESOURCES AND SERVICES

- A. Site Resources
 - i. Trees
 - 1. Presented recent photo, April 2016
 - 2. Applicant has identified drip lines, canopy acres, and all trees (19,000) have been tagged by the arborist
 - 3. Mitigation will be required
 - 4. Will trees being removed be shown on exhibit where homes are proposed?
 - a. Not currently at this level, but know how many trees will be removed based on roads. That is very detail level of information but with the many revisions, we don't have that yet
 - b. This discussion is about current and existing tree cover. Applicant will eventually be going over the project in detail, but right now that information is not available.
 - ii. Topography/slope
 - 1. Presented topography exhibit, slope map with various % slopes
 - a. On slope map, darker color is steeper slope
 - 2. The flatter the terrain, the easier it is to develop the property
 - 3. Many areas where “no-grade” lots, and only streets will be graded
 - 4. Question as to whether slope map will be included in submittal
 - a. Not yet, but it could be included in environmental document
 - iii. Soils
 - 1. Soil types have been identified
 - 2. Ione formation present, have caused problems in the RM south area
 - a. Leads to wood floors and deep foundations, the soil types have to be worked around
 - b. The soil reacts to compaction and break down, and the clay becomes expansive
 - c. Was there a geotechnical report on the Retreats? Yes, and the Ione formation was a known quantity
 - d. Important to keep drainage away from the foundations
 - 3. Purple color near village B?
 - a. Dredging and mine tailings, old mining sites down there
 - 4. Where there is no Ione formation, there's a lot of rock. Grading easier there.
 - 5. Has the asbestos been identified?

- a. In the Youngdahl report, there is an asbestos analysis
- 6. Does the map dictate how to construct, or where to construct?
 - a. Both, because some areas can be built but may be more difficult
 - b. Some areas more feasible than others because of soil type
 - c. Choices to be made about foundation types, in some cases the soils will be removed to the extent possible (such as at the Hotel)
- iv. Wetlands/flora and fauna
 - 1. Wetlands have been identified, some are not natural
 - 2. 16 total acres of wetlands, lake Jean is 4 acres alone
 - a. Of the 16 acres, avoiding as much as possible
 - b. Some mitigation will be required for “low quality” wetlands
 - c. Applicant has met with Army Corps of Engineers
 - d. Just over 1 acre will have impacts, acknowledged with the Corps
 - 3. When final lots identified, submittal will move forward with RWQCB and Corps
 - 4. How many of the wetlands are identified as ditches?
 - a. Some in Village A, some in B, some near lake Jean
 - b. Not sure of the exact amount
 - c. Some are “natural” ditches, attempting to avoid as much as possible
 - 5. What is meant by “mitigation”?
 - a. Possible mitigation on site, such as manmade wetlands
 - b. In other cases, paying into a mitigation fund
 - c. Each village will have individual application for wetland impacts
 - d. Overall goal is to completely avoid impacts
 - 6. County’s EIR will identify wetlands, but will also have to go through 404 permitting process that is totally separate from the County
 - a. Cannot apply for that separate process until there is a certified EIR
 - b. Applicant is already working with the Corps
- v. Cultural resources
 - 1. Cannot include a cultural resources exhibit because that information is confidential
 - a. Consultant has walked the site and has identified various historic and prehistoric resources
 - b. Applicant has worked with the Corps, County is working with Native Americans
 - c. Some summaries will be available through the CEQA documents, but no specific locations are made available because of possible vandalism or theft
 - 2. It will be important later on to identify where there are cultural resources so the stakeholder group can understand why development can’t happen in certain areas
 - 3. Who is the “arbiter”, is the consultant’s report accepted as final?
 - a. County is reviewer, Native Americans group will be consulted and will have an opportunity to review
 - b. County works with the Native Americans and goes on visits to work through the issues
 - c. Ultimately the arbiter is the Board of Supervisors
- vi. Group discussion
 - 1. Wetlands – Resource Protection/Conservation Area?
 - a. Runs south of the yellow bridge, to within 300 feet of the Granlee dam. It is not located within the subdivision.
 - b. It is shown on the County General Plan, and no development proposed in that area. All development proposed north of the river and CIA ditch.
 - 2. Is there a floodplain map associated with this?
 - a. To be discussed
 - 3. This is high level presentation on what constraints exist, is there a scenic discussion?
 - a. Will be part of the CEQA process
 - b. Several revisions, this process will hopefully help show where lots are
 - c. County has the latest maps, but stakeholders do not which makes it difficult to offer suggestions
 - d. Constraints are discovered as we go through the process, but we have given stakeholders what the County has

- e. We will post these exhibits on the website to share
- 4. Wetlands are just one component, what about fauna?
 - a. Rare plants study conducted by consultants at specific times of the year. Only one rare plant identified in northern portion. Studies submitted to the County.
 - b. Heritage oaks will be analyzed by the County, mitigation may be required
 - c. Animals – no special study, County will analyze potential habitat and require appropriate mitigation for any special status species
 - d. Some trees should be preserved vs. mitigation, may want some further detail on the trees
- 5. Will we be able to see how slope map corresponds with grading, terracing?
 - a. Those exhibits will be shown in the grading analysis
 - b. This process will likely result in another iteration of street, grading patterns
 - c. Grading details will follow proposed tentative maps
 - i. Steeper terrain leads to larger lots
 - d. All sewer, water and grading need to be analyzed prior to project approval. “Typical” treatments can be shown based on slope and grade
 - e. Design Guidelines will have even further constraints based on the lot sizes, to regulate inside the individual lots
 - i. Doesn’t that intensify possible drainage issues if looked at on a lot by lot basis?
 - ii. Builders on semi and custom will have to conform
 - iii. Preliminary grading plans have been submitted to the County

B. Infrastructure Services

- i. Roads/access and circulation
 - 1. Traffic study is currently in process
 - 2. Several intersections, road sections are being studied
 - 3. Have to look at various approved and proposed projects, on Sunrise, Jackson, and in Rancho Cordova
 - 4. Circulation within Rancho Murieta North
 - a. Street widths curb to curb, have identified existing streets and major intersections
 - b. Look at existing stub streets where connections were intended
 - c. Minor residential streets, some areas proposing sidewalks
 - d. Sometimes detached sidewalk proposed
 - e. Community collector with access for golf carts
 - f. Major “backbone” streets have been identified – Murieta Parkway, Camino Del Lago, and loop around the lakes
 - g. Discussion of street sections for community collector
 - i. Basically the same as existing for Camino del Lago
 - h. Does this include the Escuela Gate?
 - i. Consultant is reviewing that issue
 - ii. Stonehouse Rd improvements are a constraint
 - i. Walking along the side of the road, your competition is the golf cart not the car. Not many sidewalks in Rancho Murieta
 - j. Comments for 4th meeting re: trespass – additional pressure from circulation to encourage trespass onto surrounding property
 - k. Any special intersections that should be analyzed, send to Shelby and she will relay to DOT
 - l. Make sure that consultant asked other jurisdictions about relevant intersections
 - m. Looking at substandard County roads and possible areas where shoulders, other improvements will be required
 - i. Stonehouse, Latrobe, and Scott
 - ii. Looking at roads both inside and outside of gates
 - n. Map shown in meeting is a concept that incorporates existing street stubs that were intended to be developed. Loop is shown in main collector
 - o. Is the intent that the whole loop will be installed prior to all villages?
 - i. Access will have to be maintained throughout, some villages will have to extend beyond their boundaries

- to provide adequate access
 - ii. Phasing plan will be based on cost and incorporating required improvements
- ii. Water supply
 - 1. Analysis of system includes domestic and fire flows
 - 2. Gravity system vs. pump system
 - a. Both have been analyzed, and start interjecting developments
 - b. All projects that have been entitled are incorporated into the analysis even though they have not yet been developed
 - c. Includes proposed development, analysis reviews “worst case scenario”
 - d. Some areas are identified, near Unit 6
 - e. Gravity and pump based on elevations, and different water pressures result
 - 3. Current infrastructure is well built, fire flows appear to be met in remote areas
 - 4. “worst case” analysis include possible, future apartments on RD-30, not currently proposed
- iii. Recycle water/sewer service
 - 1. Existing systems in Rancho Murieta, including waste water treatment plant
 - 2. CSD has sewer/water/drainage master plans (created about 12 years ago)
 - a. Included potential development on Rancho North property
 - b. “paper” and theoretical sewer conditions appear to connect well
 - c. Does best to connect to the master plan
 - 3. Identify area where sewer can be installed in new development and how it can connect to the existing system
 - a. Some areas where lift stations will be installed
 - b. Wastewater treatment plant should be able to treat all of Rancho Murieta
 - c. Analysis of existing system to make sure it is adequate
 - 4. Sufficient water for development? Yes
 - 5. Purple pipe or through facility, not enough reclaimed water to use for whole of golf course
 - a. Spray fields when not enough recycled water through purple pipe, goal is to avoid contamination to the river
 - i. Phase 1 and Phase 2, other areas will receive recycled water
 - ii. Villages on back side of lakes will not be using recycled water, but will be generating wastewater
 - b. Is constructing Villages without recycled water a conflict with County policy? Unknown by staff.
 - i. County does have a Water Conservation Ordinance, unknown about whether the type of water received is addressed
 - ii. Only so much recycled water is available, but at some point in the future, if possible, CSD would want to have the infrastructure to use recycled water when they can
 - iii. Recycled water system will need the waste from the new homes, but still won’t have enough to serve them on the back side of the lakes
 - c. How much more water does the golf course need before recycled water can be used in other places?
 - i. About 100 acre feet
 - d. CSD work with surrounding land owners to determine appropriate use of the recycled water and allocation through the future
 - e. Some phase 2 developments may begin prior to total completion of phase 1
 - f. What is typical pressure for recycled water?
 - i. Varies, but there are pressure reducing stations throughout. Generally 40 psi, typical landscape system
 - ii. Instead of reducing pipe size, possible increase pressure to 80-90 psi
 - iii. Part of study is making sure that water pressure will be adequate throughout the system.
 - g. CSD will either have adequate staff or consultants to be able to maintain the lift stations and other infrastructure systems
 - i. CSD will be reviewing the proposal as it comes through
 - ii. Apply CSD standards to lift station designs
- iv. Group discussion

1. Question about revised maps – are the correct ones in the binder, or are there newer ones that the County has?
 - a. The stakeholders have the most up to date exhibits that have been released
 - b. Applicant wants input from stakeholders before creating new exhibits

C. Drainage

i. Drainage history

1. History of lakes and drainage, since the 1970's
2. Village A, B, and C primarily do not drain into lakes
 - a. On exhibits, orange lines drain to "node"
 - b. Explanation of existing drainage shed

ii. 100-year floodplain

1. Analysis of FEMA floodplain and 100-year water impacts
2. FEMA did not identify 100 year floodplain for Clementia
3. Explanation of 100 year flood and floodplain
4. Floodplain Management Ordinance Amendments – upgrade to 200 year floodplain? Grandfathering does not apply to levees, if you are inside an urban area
 - a. Are we in urban area, because we are in the Urban Services Boundary
 - b. Do we qualify as "urban" when we meet 10,000 people, and does that trigger upgrades to our levees?
 - i. Who pays for it?
 - ii. What is the impact of the 200-year floodplain on residents and who pays for the improvements – CPAC report back?
 - iii. Action Item: Get information on levee impacts to group
5. 1% standard is 4.25 inches in a 24 hour period, 2% is about 5.7 inches in 24 hour period
 - a. Do we have actual data on floods that occurred in the 80's and 90s? Unknown
 - b. Would be helpful to have data on historic high water marks, if available

iii. Lake shed management

1. County will identify finish floor elevation, looking at drainage overland release
 - a. In addition to FEMA floodplain
2. DWR does not believe that this project will trigger 200 year floodplain analysis. County will need to determine this. Action Item: DWR to review whether 200 year will be applicable. General applicability of 200 year floodplain is still relatively new and unknown.
3. About 81 acres of shed area around Calero
 - a. Required to avoid all runoff into drinking water at Calero
 - b. Historically Calero drains to the west
 - c. Analyzed on 100 year storm
4. Chesboro also for drinking water, no urban runoff
 - a. CSD installed diversion ditches
 - b. Development on north of Chesboro will have drainage systems to prevent any runoff into lake
5. Clementia, about 1300 acres that drain into lake now
 - a. Will need to figure out how to work with urban runoff and deal with recycled water
 - b. Exploring filtration systems for cleaning before sending into Clementia
 - c. Combination of filtering and diversion
6. Lake Jean
 - a. The lake drains into Clementia, diversion ditches to protect it
 - b. Houses will be within drainage sheds otherwise natural drainage would apply
7. Bass Lake
 - a. Recycled water is pumped from here to the golf course
 - b. Helps supplement the recycled water program
 - c. Diversion ditch installed around Bass Lake
 - d. Runoff comes down to concrete ditch and existing water quality basin
 - e. RMN has to analyze runoff and possible impacts to Bass Lake

- f. Water quality basin is located within the floodplain
- 8. Do the lakes have to be dredged? Impact to depth? Question for CSD.
- iv. Drainage system
 - 1. NPDES permitting, water quality requirements for natural runoff
 - 2. Low impact development
 - 3. Will need to implement drainage management systems into analysis for every village
 - 4. Streets vs. drainage into lakes are different
 - 5. Some existing water quality basins have been sized into master plan for village A
 - 6. Some water cleaning methods
 - a. Raise public awareness
 - b. Landscaping that filters runoff
 - c. Disconnected roof drains (depends on soil type)
 - d. Maintenance issues with filtration devices on drain inlets
 - e. Water quality basins
 - f. Design guidelines on the lots that will have requirements on drainage
 - i. Difference between development standards and design guidelines, the cleaning methods are development standards and will generally be established in the conditions of approval
 - ii. Will there be established standards to be held in the review process to prevent changes to drainage system by homeowners down the line?
 - g. Yes, review individual lot drainage into open space, parks
 - 7. What happens if the drainage system does not work as planned?
 - a. CC&Rs will need to be enforced, drainage laws will have to be enforced
 - b. Master association will be responsible, with County as possible arbiter
 - 8. Concerns about making mistakes in drainage, very important to protect water supply of reservoirs because they are the only water supply
 - a. CSD is reviewing agency, peer review from outside agencies when necessary
 - b. Wells on Carol's property, how much time does that buy us?
 - c. Proposed homes are shown close to the lakes, and there is not much margin for error with diversion ditches. Current homes not as close.
 - d. Concerned about possible errors with filtered runoff into Clementia
- v. Group discussion

3. QUESTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

- Possibility of tour
- CSD engineers, possibly other County staff (maybe DWR, DOT)
- Next meeting
 - Discussion of parks and trails
 - Discussion of park development agreement
 - Discussion of MBA
 - Helpful to get a "composite map" of village constraints, to show an overlay of the constraints altogether prior to discussion of the density in the MBA
 - Have the maps available before the meeting, possibly distributed at the July 8 meeting for review before the July 22 meeting. One map per village, with August lotting plan, overlaid with constraints.
 - Some interest in seeing more information from the NOP, discussion on areas that weren't covered
 - Would be helpful to have proposed trail network in large scale, maybe just new portions
 - Checklist for things that will go into the design guidelines to review at end of process