

# Rancho Murieta North Stakeholder Group Meeting #3

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

July 8, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

## DRAFT MEETING NOTES

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### A. Review of Draft 6/23 Meeting Minutes

1. Page 4 – “reducing pipe size” vs. “increasing pipe size”
2. Discussion regarding 80 psi pressure pipe
3. Comment received: Do we have the actual tree survey to share with stakeholders? Information was requested during meeting.
4. Need to have some discussion of the cultural resources, even though may not be able to know exactly what and where
5. What happens if the drainage system fails – “post meeting note: the developer is responsible during construction, master association during operation”
6. Clarify floodplain discussion

#### B. Report back – 6/23 Meeting Discussion

##### i. 200 year Flood Protection

1. 200 year flood vs. 100 year flood: County has to come up with a finding to determine what level of flood protection the community needs
2. Urban Level Flood Protection Criteria tests, all criteria must be met to require 200 year flood protection – does not apply to Rancho Murieta because criteria not met
3. 10 square miles and 10,000 residents are criteria for Rancho Murieta. Even if Murieta North is fully developed, Rancho Murieta will not be subject to this requirement.
4. County proposing to update FEMA maps, as another constraint developer looking at 500 year event
5. AE zone – elevation of 100 year event based on modeling, elevation
6. Developers analyzing flood levels independent of FEMA
7. Developer will be creating a “constraint map” per meeting #2 discussions, and flood plains will be included in constraint map
8. All “sag points” in streets and ditches, need analysis for 100 year water service, looking for “freeboard” point. Also look for 200 year event.
9. County Floodplain Management Ordinance – always 1.5 feet above base flood elevation. Every single home requires analysis.
10. Engineer confirmed with County Department of Water Resources (Mike Johnson)

##### ii. Heritage Oak Trees

1. Analyzed size, drip line, and species of all trees in report submitted to County
2. Will be mitigating based on canopy loss
3. About 10-12% probably heritage qualification (19 inch dbh or greater)
4. Specific locations are not laid out due to volume
5. County is not releasing technical documents at this time
6. Maybe EIR alternative will look at more tree preservation
7. About 19,000 trees in the inventory, what we don’t have is the GPS location of all of the trees even though we have number tags, health

8. Mitigation proposed as canopy given grouping, not inch-for-inch
9. Want to have the information to determine if there are important, heritage trees that should result in re-lotting for preservation
10. Will there be areas that are targeted for mitigation from the beginning of the project? Areas identified for preservation, replanting?
  - a. Yes, developer is already targeting areas for a tree mitigation plan
11. Landmark trees also identified in the General Plan, definition somewhat unclear. Unknown if level of analysis calls out these trees thus far
12. Is tree list broken out by village?
  - a. Yes, we can calculate # and % of heritage trees for village
13. Developer would like to know the location of significant trees regardless of number
  - a. Reiterate interest in tour
14. Concern about concept of mitigation in Rancho Murieta, need some assurance that what is proposed is what will actually happen
  - a. County reviews mitigation plan
  - b. Concern about County, worried that the mitigation plan will not be properly executed. Want more rigor in enforcement.
  - c. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
  - d. MMRP may need more stringent evaluation by County staff, possibly need more monitoring time
15. When more clear lotting plan, have a better idea which trees for proposed for removal?
  - a. Yes, all will have to be analyzed, even trees potentially removed by custom lot builder in the future

## 2. OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES

### A. Fire, Safety & Crime

1. Sac Metro Fire is the applicable agency, have requirements and response times. CalFire response as well for wildfires
2. CSD has security component
3. Newer projects have to annex into CFD 2005-1, additional taxes for new homeowners to assist with police services. Believed that the fee is about \$380 per lot

### B. Group Discussion

1. Who is responsible for Sheriff's Department assessment? We get response, but no patrol. Combined with first response from CSD security, and in light of continuing growth/infrastructure...how do we get a balance between resources? Is this inclusive in analysis of development's impact?
  - a. New assessments apply to every new home
  - b. For CSD, every lot has to pay another impact fee. CSD is putting together a policy to determine how money will be spent. CSD looking to have study done by security consulting firm to determine how best to improve, provide security services
  - c. CSD is already collecting from Murieta Gardens, in neighborhood of several million dollars.
  - d. Belief that resources will be primarily dedicated to new uses...does money catch up with immediate need?
  - e. Money is meant to do enhancements to existing systems and services, don't have the resources to add "bodies" so give officers more tools
  - f. Looking into putting in a camera system, reevaluate service time
  - g. Any way to have hotel, supermarket have their own private security?
    - No, they pay a monthly security tax. Commercial is based on square footage
    - Security fee currently being paid, but fee will increase once the uses are constructed
  - h. New residents will have to pay for sheriff protection that current homeowners will not have to pay for...because they are paying more, they are not necessarily increasing an impact
  - i. Developers do not control how the resources, money is allocated
  - j. Concern that resources will not keep up with radical change, anticipated within the next three years
  - k. Looking to focus for feedback within the gate
  - l. Security and allocation is important issue, also has an impact on trespass on surrounding property. Neighboring

property owners have been requesting for 9 years for improved response on trespass, significant cost to implement private security system and sheriff, CSD can't or don't respond.

- Since people are going to be a lot closer with new development, this is going to mean that more people trespassing, high cost of monitoring on part of homeowner. Want group to be aware that this is a concern.
- Suggested that RMA, CSD can work together to educate Murieta residents to respect property
- Request to investigate long term structural, physical solutions for trespass problems

### **3. PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS AMENITIES**

#### **A. Quimby Acreage**

1. Quimby – 5 acres parkland per 1,000 people
2. 136 acre parcel dedicated to Sacramento County in 1979, supposed to satisfy all park acreage requirement for Rancho Murieta. Still unimproved. Park facilities have not been installed along river.
3. Access easement rights along the river, within 300-400 feet from river
4. Murieta Gardens was required to install post and cable fence along park, as well as signs that park is not open, and parking stalls
5. Action Item: Share a copy of the exhibit called “Existing Open Space Plan for Rancho Murieta” with stakeholder group

#### **B. Parks and Open Space**

##### **i. Existing Amenities**

1. Existing open space, parks, golf courses
2. 1 acre park under construction
3. New open spaces, common area around the Retreats
4. Residences East, West, Riverview, Lakeview open space areas are proposed
5. Action Item: “Proposed and Existing Open Space Plan for Rancho Murieta” exhibit to share with stakeholders
6. Member of public - 136 acre park meant to establish “Cosumnes River Parkway”

##### **ii. Proposed Amenities**

1. Acres proposed within Rancho Murieta North

#### **C. Trails**

##### **i. Existing Amenities**

1. Exhibit showing existing trail system throughout, recorded easements showing locations of existing trails

##### **ii. Proposed Amenities**

1. Showing Exhibit E, with proposed trail plan with RMA
2. Proposed Trail Plan for Rancho Murieta North
  - a. The currently proposed trail plan is associated with current layout, may change if village layouts changed
  - b. Trail layouts are due at the time of final maps

#### **D. Group Discussion**

1. RMA has adopted a different layout, based on Exhibit E
2. Trail Stewardship would like to see all as nature trails, could be associated with mitigation. Wants to have meandering paths that could go in places where houses cannot go, like steep slopes. Very popular with Rancho Murieta residents, upkeep has been on a volunteer basis, and do not want to see blacktop, handrails, and striping
3. Some trails adjacent to streets may have parking spaces next to them, for access
4. Current trail system a very important asset to residents
5. Trails are a good asset, but people do deviate from trails and trespass out of Rancho Murieta so design is very important
6. Are any trails proposed on property not belonging to Rancho North?
  - a. All trails shown on map belong to Rancho North

### **4. PARK DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

#### **A. Overview/Summary of Existing Agreements**

1. County provided two summary documents of the agreements to give an overview of what the agreements address...just a summary, not an analysis or interpretation
2. Parks Development Agreement (PDA) in 1991 to set up a park system, how identified, improved, access, financed, etc. Relationship of RMA, CSD to parks. Framework for how parks, trails to be developed over time.
3. Rancho North proposing trails, PDA proposes how to layout over time
4. May be some alignment issues, level of improvement differences between proposed by Rancho North and PDA

#### B. Group Discussion

1. RMA believes some provisions on PDA should be considered project restraints, and is binding to parties involved with this process
2. PDA layout shows “approximate” location of trail, Exhibit E, but final to be laid out in the individual subdivisions
  - a. Developer, RMA should agree on location of trails per PDA
  - b. At this point, the differences are significant and RMA would prefer plans to be better aligned
  - c. Discussion of trails should not apply to south area, because does not apply to Rancho Murieta North project
3. RMA presents exhibit that shows North proposed trail location vs. Exhibit E trails. North plans shows many trails on streets, RMA does not want trail system to be on-street
  - a. Class 1 trail, 12 foot wide, asphalt paved proposed to connect places from A to B
  - b. Concern that a private contract that over the years the Parks Committee has agreed to, County may supersede. Belief that developer is bound to agreement regardless of County position
  - c. Did Parks Committee formally adopt plan in 2003?
    - Yes, they adopted Exhibit E and defined what trails would look like, adopted County specifications for Class 1 trails.
    - Class 1, 2 and 3 are formal designations that are different than nature trails
  - d. How resolve? Need to have a separate meeting to discuss trail system between now and next meeting – developers, RMA, trail stewardship.
  - e. Thought that there was supposed to be more nature trails, ideally there could be some nature trails that meander all throughout the community without having to connect to the streets
  - f. Action Item: Request copy of RMA’s overlaid trail exhibit to share with stakeholders
  - g. As part of analysis, can we look for areas where trespass is most likely to occur and possible materials to discourage trespass?
    - It is Rancho North’s responsibility to put in proper fences and work to prevent trespass
    - Need to install some system to stop trespass that will function for generations
  - h. SOLOS believes that density, easements will fundamentally alter trail system
  - i. Trail created on Granlees property without owner consent, similar issues with trespass. Mr. Geyer would like to connect with group to be involved in issue resolution. Not a MTS trail.
    - Action Item: include Mr. Geyer’s property in analysis of anti-trespass efforts

## 5. MUTUAL BENEFIT AGREEMENT

#### A. Overview/Summary of Existing Agreement

1. Packet has summary of MBA. Document was created in 2003. Disputes at the time between various parties, attempt to resolve issues. Focus of the MBA on Exhibit H is 5.04. MBA says that Rancho North should be in conformance with Exhibit H, which establishes village counts and unit transfers.
2. Applicant establishes that it is known that proposal does not conform with totals established in Exhibit H
3. MBA rose out of litigation, which means there is enforcement by a court

#### B. Exhibit H

1. Allocates different units to villages, which have names different than those proposed by project
2. 10% max transfer of units between villages, total unit cap not to be exceeded
3. Also provision for “Vineyard Estates at Lake Calero”, possible flexibility in total units
4. Acknowledged that project does not conform to unit counts, greater in some villages
5. Village unit counts established without thorough analysis of physical/resource constraints

### C. Group Discussion

1. Important to acknowledge that the MBA is a recorded agreement, obligations run with the land, and is enforceable by the court because it resulted from litigation
2. Ability to change terms of the agreement does not live in stakeholder group, parties to the MBA would need to work on a formal amendment
3. Recommendations out of the group could potentially lead to further discussion
4. Who are the parties involved?
  - a. Foreclosure on property, RMA was concerned about fee assessments and parks agreements. Many years of litigation with multiple parties.
5. Language in 5.04 is important, "consent to development". "RMA endorses and will support a development in conformance with Exhibit H". Applicant believes that project is only bound to this agreement insofar as they want RMA's support.
6. Difficult to calculate compliance without finished design, Village A is lopsided because it was supposed to be higher density.
  - a. Need to share translation between MBA village names, proposed village names
  - b. Never was a lot plan associated with Exhibit H
  - c. Concept at the time was 48 lots in Village D, could be bumped up
7. Applicant's hope is to end up at a place where they could work with RMA to amend MBA for a more acceptable allocation of lots
  - a. Applicant will be handing out exhibit with aggregate constraints shown, want stakeholders to "mark up" this exhibit to discuss what each group believes would improve the plans. Applicant ultimately wants to come back to stakeholder group with revised plans and explain reasons for changes.

## 6. OTHER ITEMS/PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

### A. Review Constraint Exhibits

1. How many units are on each of the maps? Shown
2. Each exhibit has all of the constraints discussed at meeting #2, overlaid
3. Slopes, wetlands, trees, floodplains, etc.
4. Clarified 1983 master plan map
5. Lots that are alphabetically identified are open space and utility lot
6. Each stakeholder group will get a large scale exhibit set
7. Reflects current 827 lot plan
8. Will group reconvene after environmental review process? How will County process/constraints impact changes to the project?
  - a. Applicant believes we should identify a bench mark time for the release the draft EIR, can come back and discuss with the stakeholder group
  - b. Applicant wants as much community support as possible through communication process, but County process still required
  - c. Review of ground rules to remind what is intended overall outcome of process...is there language that parties can change their opinion later on based on the environmental analysis?
  - d. Not intended to be a consensus process, we can decide later on whether or not to reconvene at the appropriate time. Could be in the applicant's interest to improve consensus.
  - e. Applicant believes it makes sense, consensus or not, to come back with the stakeholder group and share changes as a result of analysis and processing
9. Are we trying to stay at the 827 unit count?
  - a. Want to know if there's any consideration for lots in Murieta Park, areas adjacent to the golf course. Possible to make a trade for some open space that may be more "park friendly" than 11 acres.
10. Class 1 trail system conflicts with lake runoff controls?
  - a. Can be identified, tilted to prevent runoff into lakes
  - b. No matter what, it needs to be kept out of the lakes

c. Trail size and shape, whatever outcome, will be incorporated into the drainage plan

B. Group Assignment

1. Stakeholders to begin work on group analysis, review the exhibits and work out suggestions
2. Prioritize the constraints, based on your group's interests
3. If you were to provide some direction on how to modify the land use plans, what would your suggestions be?
4. If you were going to transfer, trade, or reduce, where would that occur?
5. Prepare one page summary report to have productive discussion at next meeting
6. Discrepancy on the numbers in Exhibit H, and transferring units
  - a. Should be discussed in different forum
7. Each stakeholder group will have a chance to present at the next meeting
8. Security considerations will be reviewed and handled regardless of ultimate land plan