

# **DRY CREEK PUBLIC PLANNING TEAM**

## ***Minutes of Meeting #2, Session #2***

### ***Goals and Policies***

Date: April 22, 2003

Place: Roseville Civic Center

#### **Attendees:**

Barbara Heyward, Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association,  
Stephanie Austin, Friends and Lovers of Miners Ravine,  
Noe Fierros, Placer County Planning,  
Lisa Ferrari, City of Roseville,  
Mike Wixon, City of Roseville,  
Mark Morse, City of Roseville  
Chris Schmidt, Placer County Planning,  
Ernie McPherson, Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations,  
George Brown, Dry Creek Mac,  
Ed Armstrong, Foothill Associates,  
Kate Kirsh, Foothill Associates

#### **Discussion**

Kate began the meeting by briefly reviewing the progress made at the last meeting, and distributing the comments that we had received. She also stressed that we are working to develop a document that represents the consensus of the group.

#### **Discussion on Goals and Policies**

In the interest of time, we quickly moved into a discussion on specific goals and policy statements. The majority of the comments were included in the materials distributed, which will be available on our website. Additional comments and discussion were as follows:

#### ***Goal 1***

##### **Policy 1.4A**

We discussed an exemption for non-native species. The consensus of the group was that they didn't want to include an exemption at this point in time.

##### **Policy 1.9A**

We discussed how to reconcile this policy with those already adopted by the local jurisdictions. We agreed to reword the policy to a more active voice (and consequently remove the "shall") such as "Wherever possible, establish a Riparian Protection Zone..." Also add an exception for areas where a buffer is already established by local jurisdictions. Clarify that the zone does not include private property and that these policies are only recommended for private property owners.

**Policy 1.9C**

Remove the exception that allows for planting of non-native species for bank stabilization (C5). The comment on C7 regarding use of class I trails for maintenance access will be incorporated into Goal 3. There was a discussion about whether this plan affects private property owners, and if we need to allow for other types of maintenance than are listed. Roseville indicated that they differentiate between private residential and commercial in terms of the allowable forms of vegetation control.

**Policy 1.9D**

The comment regarding good design goals will be incorporated into Goal #5.

**Policy 1.10B**

The forty foot specification for the width of the firebreak will be reworded such that the width will be determined by the local fire agency as sufficient for fire protection.

**Policy 1.15F**

Policy will be changed too educate users to pick up after their pets and to keep horses on designated trails.

**Policy 1.16E**

Policy will be clarified to better define “significant compromise.”

***Goal #3*****Policy 3.4**

Define “multi-use” as it applies to these policies to accommodate as many uses as feasible (typically bike, pedestrian and equestrian).

***Goal #4*****Policy 4.1A**

“Minimal” will be changed to “minimum.” There was a question about whether this implies that the trails will be lighted. The group agreed that this policy does not apply to trails, since they are often closed from sunset to sunrise.

***Goal #5*****Policy 5.1**

There was discussion about the use of fertilizers in flood areas, and the conjunctive use of areas such as parks and ball fields. The decision was made not to include a policy on conjunctive use.

**Policy 5.5**

It was requested that this policy be given a more positive wording. Some discussion occurred regarding motorized access. Roseville currently permits motorized scooters that do not exceed 5 mph.

**Policies 5.9, 5.11 and 5.13**

These separate policies will be combined into one policy which restricts those uses not designated for a trail. While it is ideal to separate horses from mountain bikes, it is not always practical. We need to establish rules for safe trail use.

### **Policy 5.15**

It was agreed to incorporate Ernie's comment on patrols. Fishing access was discussed briefly. We agreed to add a policy that jurisdictions can designate fishing access points that users will be encouraged to use, but that fishing access in other areas is not prohibited.

### **Policy 5.17**

Add connections *within* nearby communities (as well as between).

## **Goal #6**

### **Policy 6.5**

Clarify that if structural modifications are necessary, designs will be as environmentally sensitive as possible, considering wildlife habitat and aesthetic values.

## **Goal #7**

Add a policy for periodic review of these goals and policies by the local jurisdictions.

### **Policy 7.3**

The group discussed the inclusion of a policy that is consistent with Placer County Legacy Open Space initiative. It was agreed to change "shall" to "should", and add clarify the policy to read "...County and regional open space initiatives such as the Placer County Legacy Open Space initiative."

## **Goal #8**

### **Policy 8.4**

There was discussion about a Greenway mitigation fund as well as mitigation lands within the Greenway. Stephanie Austin had concerns that if we set up a fund, there may be some delay in spending the funds for mitigation. The group was in general agreement that a policy to allow a mitigation fund should be added.

## **Goal #9**

### **Policy 9.5**

This policy will be generalized to specify that new buildings shall be sited and designed to minimize visual impacts to the Greenway using techniques such as vegetative screening, setbacks, etc. Policies 9.5 and 9.6 will be combined.

### **Policy 9.11**

Open space set aside in subdivision projects may not necessarily be designated as "public open space". Roseville currently has options to either dedicate it to the City, or designate it as a floodplain area in perpetuity. It may or may not be publicly owned, and may or may not have public access. The policy will be modified to read "open space" instead of "public open space". This policy will also encourage CC&Rs to include Greenway objectives.

The next meeting will be on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2003 from 9:30AM until 11:30AM in the Roseville Civic Center. The group will examine the draft physical locations for the Greenway, connections to existing trails and roads, Greenway mixed-use trail corridors vs. habitat conservation corridors, and Greenway opportunities and constraints.