

# DRY CREEK PUBLIC PLANNING TEAM

## *Minutes of Meeting #2*

### *Goals and Policies*

Date: April 11, 2003

Place: Roseville Civic Center

#### **Attendees:**

Barbara Heyward, Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association,  
Marilyn Jasper, Sierra Club/Clover Valley Foundation,  
Stephanie Austin, Friends and Lovers of Miners Ravine,  
Noe Fierros, Placer County Planning,  
Lisa Ferrari, City of Roseville,  
Terri Shirhall, City of Roseville,  
Mike Wixon, City of Roseville,  
Cathy Haagen-Smit, Bicycle Advocate,  
David Siegel, Rocklin Resident,  
Peggy Petersen, Granite Bay Resident,  
Chris Schmidt, Placer County Planning,  
Ernie McPherson, Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations,  
Ed Pandolfino, Sierra Foothills Audubon,  
George Brown, Dry Creek Mac,  
Ed Armstrong, Foothill Associates,  
Kate Kirsh, Foothill Associates

#### **Discussion**

The meeting began with an introduction by Kate Kirsh to the project goals, jurisdictions, and purpose of the goals and policy document distributed to the PPT via email prior to the meeting. Of particular concern was the potential for the Greenway Plan to eventually be adopted or approved by the various jurisdictions. The group discussed the possibility of recommending some sort of Greenway oversight body, but recognized that the local jurisdictions would need to agree to and support this approach for it to be effective.

Discussion followed regarding the specificity of the goals and policies, and their relationship to the related goals and policies already adopted by the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville is supportive of the Master Plan for the Greenway, but has already addressed many of the Greenway objectives locally through a variety of other planning methods and programs within the City. Approval of these local plans and policies involved public review and comment. Mike Wixon and Teri Shirhall explained that in light of this it would be somewhat redundant and counterproductive for the City to formally adopt the Greenway Plan, although they expected that the City would formally support the plan. Mike Wixon suggested a matrix be developed that identified which specific draft Greenway policies were in concert or conflict with the goals and policies of the various jurisdictional agencies, including Roseville. This would help the City identify those Greenway policies that could potentially be looked at to suggest enhancements to

the City's existing programs as well as policies that the City could not reasonably expect to implement due to conflicts with other planning or resource priorities and limitations.

Kate then suggested that we proceed through a review of the specific policies in order to get an idea of the degree to which they were compatible with Roseville's existing programs and policies. There was also concern expressed that Rocklin and Loomis representatives opted not to participate in the PPT. Kate stated that representatives of Rocklin and Loomis are members of the Project Oversight Committee, and expect to receive the draft goals and objectives for review following this initial review by the PPT.

A question was raised about public input to the Greenway plan. It was explained that two public review sessions will be held between June and September.

### **General Discussion on Goals**

There was some discussion on Goal #3 as to the definition of a "continuous open space corridor." Kate explained that this term generally referred to an undeveloped use. Roseville had concerns that this goal was unrealistic for an urban or infill area. There was general agreement that the creek itself formed a continuous open space corridor by itself, regardless of how large of a riparian buffer surrounded it, so this goal is largely met by not culverting or otherwise burying the creek. There was a suggestion to make this goal consistent with the West Placer HCP, and Kate pointed out that Policy 7.4 serves this function.

There was some concern about the wording in Goal #7; that goal will be rewritten to clarify.

### **Discussion on Specific Goals and Objectives**

This section summarizes the comments and discussion on specific policies within each goal area. Due to time constraints, only goal 1 was addressed at this meeting.

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

##### **Policy 1.1**

Add definition of "adjacent". Add wording to encourage use of native plants in the Greenway. Remove "by providing connecting corridors and habitat diversity" from the Goal, and add as a policy statement.

##### **Policy 1.3**

Add "to the extent feasible" to the policy statement. Reduce the use of mandatory wording. Add "trails" to the list of included land uses. Some discussion occurred on the definition of a "public use area". This may be changed to a "designated public use area" for clarity.

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

Add an exclusion on the use of native plants for developed open space areas such as active park sites. There was a question as to whether the City of Roseville had undeveloped lands on the creeks that could be used for development. Roseville responded that their undeveloped lands were mostly on the east side of the city, where the land along the creeks has been set aside as open space.

### **Policy 1.5**

A question had been raised previously by Loren Clark with Placer County Planning on who enforces the use of the planting lists. Kate indicated that if this plan was adopted or endorsed by the local jurisdictions, they would be responsible for using this list when planning public projects. Terri Shirhall with the City of Roseville wanted public parks to be specified as a land use that was exempt from this goal.

Roseville requested that the “shalls” in this document be changed to “shoulds.” Concern was expressed by the other members of the PPT that doing so would significantly reduce the usefulness of the Master Plan, and we agreed to leave the “shalls” in place unless we determine a particular conflict with an agency goal or policy.

### **Policy 1.6**

LBHA and Roseville would like bike and horse trails excluded from these regulations, since it is often desirable to have such trails beneath the canopy of native oaks. We agreed to reword this policy to limit activities that would have an adverse impact on native oak trees, as determined by a certified arborist. Roseville pointed out that they occasionally have to remove oak trees to locate trails, and this policy should allow for this activity, given appropriate mitigation measures.

### **Policy 1.7**

There was some concern that snags would be removed prematurely by this regulation, and they form valuable habitat. There was general agreement to change the word “threat” to “imminent threat”. Roseville pointed out that their MOU encourages leaving large woody debris (downed snags) in the creek, but orienting them so that they are parallel to the channel to reduce the restriction of flood waters.

There was discussion about how to manage beavers and beaver dams. Roseville’s policy is to leave them unless they impact on safety, property, or infrastructure, which can often be the case with exacerbated flooding. The beaver population has gotten to the point where they may need a new policy. They have also tried beaver releavers (culverts) in some cases, but those have to be regularly maintained. There are also issues with beaver dam impacts to fish migration and vernal pool encroachment. We will add a policy to this plan to develop beaver controls, but leave it general enough to allow individual jurisdictions to develop their own control plans. We may want to call for a study to determine sustainable beaver population levels.

There was a question about definition of a “floodway,” and it was agreed to remove this word from the policy.

### **Policy 1.8**

Roseville pointed out that they have their own plan for vegetation management, and also suggested that policies in our document should not target areas outside of our study area boundary, such as upstream or downstream of the Greenway. We agreed to delete this policy.

A discussion occurred about the Roseville WWTF introducing water to the Greenway, via treated effluent discharges, effects of nitrate/nitrite levels contained in this effluent, and potential habitat impacts if these water discharges were discontinued. Kate relayed a conversation with Art O’Brien, in which he explained that the WWTF discharges are regulated under an NPDES permit to limit adverse impacts on the creek and that DFG would oppose eliminating the flow from the system because of habitat impacts

### **Policy 1.9**

1.9.A Kate pointed out that the 175’ width was consistent with policy in the Sacramento County Dry Creek Parkway Plan. Placer County regulations dictate 100’ from the centerline of perennial creeks, and Roseville uses the 100 year floodplain and has their own policies which dictate development around the creek. They have already allocated open space areas either in their

specific plans or by the 100 year floodplain, and do not plan on redefining riparian protection zones outside of those boundaries (which are often more generous than the 175' buffer proposed.)

It was requested to clarify the wording to specify 175' on each side of the creek. Secondary channels should be included when defining the edge of the creek bank for determination of the buffer. Kate pointed out that this policy does not state what the buffer should be if 175' is not available.

1.9.C1. Include snags in native vegetation protected under this policy

1.9.C3. Roseville suggested this policy may be too restrictive, since sometimes hard fixes are needed. It was agreed to allow structural fixes where needed for protection of property or public safety.

1.9.C4. Add mowing and utilities to the exceptions for motorized access.

1.9.C6 Add trail maintenance to the allowed list of herbicide use.

1.9.C7 Class I bike trails should be used where feasible for maintenance access, but where not available, roads are needed. For access within the creek itself, it may be acceptable to have a paved road down the bank that becomes dirt at the bottom of the bank. Utilities including water, sewer, electric, communication and flood gauges should be added to the list of activities/improvements permitted in the Riparian Protection Zone.

## **Miscellaneous Major Issues on Goals**

### ***Dogs***

A concern was expressed that no policies on dog use in the Greenway have been proposed. Roseville has policies which prohibit dogs in all open space areas of the City. Operationally, they don't always have the resources to enforce this, but will cite people if dogs are off-leash. Some members of the PPT would like to see dogs prohibited in the Greenway. There was discussion on this issue, and it was decided to add a policy to encourage jurisdictions to identify high quality resource areas where additional restrictions would apply, such as excluding dogs and other pets (or possibly humans), and to designated "dog-friendly" use areas..

## **How to Proceed**

The PPT ran out of time for complete discussion on the Goals and Policies, and will reconvene on April 22<sup>nd</sup> from 9:30AM to 11:30AM in the same location at the Roseville Civic Center. In the meantime, PPT members will email their further comments on the draft Goals and Policies to Kate Kirsh at [kate@foothill.com](mailto:kate@foothill.com). She will collect the comments, consolidate them, and bring them back to the group at the next meeting for focused discussion. Comments are due to Kate by this Friday, April 18<sup>th</sup> to allow time for dissemination and review prior to the next meeting.