

Development Advisory Committee Meeting

311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 774-5334

July 13, 2011 Approved Minutes

1. Roll Call

Committee Members Present: Scott Barber, Steve Hicks, Rick Jordan, Marcus Lo Duca, Krista

Looza, Tom Moe, Jack Paddon, Betty Sanchez, Mark Sauer,

Steve Schnable, John Tallman

Committee Members Absent: Brett Baumgarten, Steve Pease

Staff Present: Chris Robles, Bob Schmitt, Lonnye Heple

2. Approval of Minutes of June 8, 2011 Meeting

A motion was made by Scott Barber and seconded by Steve Hicks to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2011 meeting.

Motion Passed Unanimously

3. Public Comment

Acting Chair Steve Schnable opened the floor for Public Comments. No comments.

4. Draft State Storm Water Permit Update – Marc Stout and Kelye McKinney

Marc and Kelye gave an overview of the draft Storm Water Permit. They encouraged the Committee to reach out to others and comment on this draft permit. They also asked for support at the State Board meeting scheduled for July 19, 2011 @ 9:00 a.m. The coalition that has been organized by the City of Roseville will be requesting an extension of the review period at this meeting. The following are some of the concerns the City has regarding the permit:

- The cost to the City to implement the permit could go from \$800,000 a year to approximately \$4 million a year.
- A watershed study is required and will be very costly
- Full retention of 85% of storm water will be required. The City is requesting that this requirement be removed.
- Only projects that have been submitted for entitlements such as small lot subdivision maps will be grandfathered. This does not include Specific Plans. Committee Member Tallman requested that staff request that Specific Plans be grandfathered as well.
- Will increase plan review and inspection time
- Trash reduction program will need to be implemented

See Attachment 1 for more information

5. Public Works Subcommittee Update – Marc Stout

The Subcommittee created a list of standards that are to be reviewed (Attachment 2) Chair LoDuca requested as the Subcommittee makes progress to provide an update to the Committee.

Staff also met with departments regarding consolidating the plan review process. This will take time to implement as it is changing the entire process and training of staff. Chair LoDuca requested that this be a standing item on future agendas to provide an update to the Committee.

An update on the progress of the standards will be given at the August meeting and at the September meeting an update will be given on the consolidation of the plan review process..

6. Creation of a Fee Deferral Subcommittee – Chris Robles

Chris requested volunteers to serve on the Fee Deferral Subcommittee. The following Committee Members volunteered to serve: John Tallman, Mark Sauer, Steve Hicks, Marcus LoDuca and Steve Schnable

Tuesdays or Thursdays at 8:00 a.m. work best for this group to meet.

7. Development Advisory Committee Review of First Six Months – Chris Robles

The Committee requested the following additions:

Item #11 – Add Date

Item #12 - Add Date

Item #14 - Add September 2011

See Attachment 3

8. Development Advisory Committee Procedures – Chris Robles

The Committee discussed and reviewed the proposed changes to the attendance policy in the DAC Meeting procedures.

A motion was made by John Tallman to recommend the City Council approve a Resolution modifying the Development Advisory Committee Meeting procedures pertaining to the attendance policy. Steve Hicks seconded the motion.

Motion Pass Unanimously

9. Update from the City Manager's Office - Chris Robles

Upcoming Meetings

- a. Review DAC meeting format August meeting
- b. Review and recommend changes to local Fire Code Amendments
- c. Technology Fee supporting development services
- d. Review changes to the Building Division plan review process
- e. Review cost and process comparisons of contractor install electric improvements September meeting

City Manager Ray Kerridge will be asked to attend the August meeting.

10. Adjournment – 6:45 p.m.



State Stormwater Permit What Can You Do?

- Send letter to the Board requesting a review period extension
- Review the permit and submit written comments (focus on the economic impacts to business and development in CA)
- Help to educate others
- Contact your legislators that represent the areas you do business in (inform of economic impacts)
- Attend Board Hearing and put statements on record



State Stormwater Permit What Can You Do?

Link to State Board web site and copy of permit:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water issues/programs/stormwater/

- Comment period for permit ends August 8, 2011
- Next State Board meeting July 19th 9:00 am Cal EPA Building - 1001 I Street, Sacramento
- Cal EPA Building 1001 I Street, Sacramento Public Hearing on Permit - November 2011

DAC P/W SUBCOMMITTEE - Design & Construction Standards to be Reviewed

Mtg Date	DEPARTMENT	STANDARDS DESCRIPTION	ISSUE/EXPLANATION	CURRENT STANDARD	CITY POSITION/OUTCOME
3/16/2011	P/W	ROADWAY STRUCTURAL SECTION INCREASE EXCESSIVE TO PRIOR SPEC	T.I. Increase resulted in thicker roadways, thus expensive	Design Standard Revision 2009	
	P/W	MEANDERING AND DETACHED SIDEWALK THICKNESS, 6"		6" thick for both	
3/30/2011	P/W	MEDIAN CURB CONFIGURATION TO COMPLICATED AND EXPENSIVE TO CONSTRUCT		Changed detail at request of Parks	
	EUD	HYDRANT SPACINGS TOO CLOSE	With new fire sprinkler rgmt, increase hydrant spacing's or reduce pipe diameter		
	EUD	WARRANTY AND ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURES NOT TIMELY-HAVE PAST ISSUES	Timely correspondence, warranty punch lists, communication in general difficult	New P/W Electronic Procedure in place	
5/25/2011	P/W	STRUCTURAL SECTIONS EXCESSIVE	T.L's excessive		
	ΡW	DESIGN STANDARDS TABLE 7.2 UNCLEAR, MISSING DATA	Ĭ		
	W/d	BIKE LANES TOO WIDE, 8' BESIDENTIAL SIDEWALKS	big bike lanes and big s/w's results in excessive r/w widths Why require on both sides of streets. Unlike private subdivisions	ADA Compliance	
	AAT	NEGIDENTIAL SIDENTIALS			
6/22/2011	W/d	DETACHED SIDEWALKS TOO COSTLY	Obliset up. irrig. Sleeves, dbl BMP's	Residential-developer option, Regid collector/Arter.	
	Š	MONDI ITUR OF ITTED AND RECENTAL K. R. IDDAGE	Ity with concrete drying out,	Compacted soil subgrade without asphalt	
	AAL	MONOETHIS CORBIGO HER AND SIDEWALK SUBBASE		Revised Standard in 2009 - illegal car	
	P/W	TEMPORARY BARRICADES AT STUB STREETS	Increased liability, expensive	parking	
	EUD	4" CLAY PIPE LATERALS	Too brittle, too sensitive, 90% failures. consider ABS laterals like other iurisdictions	VCP per EUD	
	Ę.	WATER - DUCTILE IRON PIPE & FITTINGS - CONSIDER PLASTIC ALT.	Crossings and under creeks. Poly inside and encasement outside? Just use plastic	Ductile with stainless steel bolts per EUD	
	EUD	ESTABLISH APPROVED ALTERNATES FOR ISOLATED CASES - COMMON SENSE	Blue Oaks Bridge 330' brass blow off example. Cost \$10/if vs. \$1.60/if	EUD Spec	
	ON.	HYDRANTS - RESTRAINED JOINTS& THRUST BLOCKES, MATERIAL	redundant methods-choose one. Bronze \$1900, Iron \$1400.	EUD Spec	
	CITY	WORKING CONSTRAINTS - TRAFFIC CONTROL AND SWIPP REQUIREMENTS	į.	Other jurisdictions	
	PLANNING	WORKING HOUR RESTRICTIONS - NOISE AND SPARE THE AIR	Low production with temp extremes results high costs	City Noise Ordinance	
	P/W-PARKS	MODIFY PRESENT DESIGN TO BE MORE EFFICIENT, I.e. MATERIALS	bike trail sections, drainage access roads, and temp roads too thick, costly. Consider regrind	71-5.A Grindings allowed as approved	
	END	AVOID CHANGES IN THE FIELD ONCE PLANS APPROVED	Once plans approved, build as approved-i.e. Fratis Park back flow change	EUD new spec enforced	
	EUD	STAINLESS STEEL BOLTS FOR DUCTILE FITTINGS	Standard bolts as supplied adequate. 35 year vs. 50 year life.	EUD Spec	
	P/W-EUD	PROVIDE CONSISTENT INSPECTION SERVICES	Consistency with inspectors and standards- degrees of variance exists	consistency enforced	
	EUD	INSPECTORS NEARLY PRACTICE METHOD SPEC VS. PERFORMANCE SPEC	Inspectors may request additional measures as observed and out of specs		
	- E	WATER CROSS CONNECTION TESTING PROCEDURES	Common Sense test method preferred. Open domestic valve and watch for water flow	EUD Spec	
	EUD	TEMPORARY WATER METER BACK FLOW TEST PROCEDURES	too cumbersome. Re-evaluate entire procedure for simplicity	EUD Spec	



Development Advisory Committee Staff Report – July 13, 2011

Contact: Chris Robles crobles@roseville.ca.us (916) 774-5421

Agenda Item - #7: Development Advisory Committee Review of First Six Months

Recommendation

Review the progress of the DAC over the first six months of committee meetings. Provide staff with comments and direction on the content of the materials and actions taken by the committee.

Background

Staff is providing a review of the Committee agendas and topics for two purposes as follows:

- 1. The committee has been meeting for over six months and this creates an opportunity for a self-check to evaluate the Committee progress toward meeting the Committees stated purpose.
- 2. Staff will be providing City Council with a progress report updating the Council on the actions taken by the Committee.

Listed below are the topics and actions taken by the Committee and staff on the development services and regulation reviewed to date:

- 1. Orientation and review of meeting procedures
- 2. Creation of a first year work program
- 3. Reviewed the entitlement and plan review processes
- 4. Reviewed solutions for web based permitting and development services
- 5. Reviewed the traffic mitigation fee update and created a subcommittee to review details of the fee costs assumptions
- 6. Reviewed a proposal to increase building permit fees for tenant improvements and miscellaneous permits. Committee supported the increase for miscellaneous permits and recommended against the increase for tenant improvements. Staff continues to evaluate options to operate within existing revenues.
- 7. Committee recomended the development impact fee annual adjustment be suspended. This recommendation was taken forward to Council and Council approved the suspension on the consent calendar.
- 8. Committee reviewed the tenant improvement processes and provided staff with recommendations on key services and response time frames. Staff has expanded the services options for tenant improvements and will report back to the Committee on the expanded services.
- 9. Reviewed and commented on the Community Wide Sustainability Action Plan and provided the opportunity for public comment.
- 10. Committee and Public Works Subcommittee made recommendations on the processing of model homes which resulted in a reduction in the required improvements and project costs.
- 11. Committee made recommendations for consolidation of plan review services where multiple departments are involved. Staff is making progress on the consolidation of plan review services that will enhance services, reduce project management costs and provide for

- greater efficiency in plan review. Staff expects to bring this process back to the Committee this fall for action.
- 12. The Public Works Subcommittee has identified a list of improvement standards and regulations that result in increased material or construction costs. Staff expects to bring the evaluation and recommendations for alternatives back to the Committee late summer for action.
- 13. Committee reviewed the Roseville Fire Amendments and recomended changes in the midrise regulation, fire sprinkler standards and residential cul-de-sac designs. Staff expects to bring recommendations and alternatives back to the Committee action in August.
- 14. Committee reviewed the Roseville Electrics processes for design and construction. The Committee recommended that private contractors be allowed to install electric improvements. Staff will be returning to the Committee with an evaluation and cost comparison of contractor installed electric improvements.

Much of the first six months of meetings has been focused on reviewing the City's existing processes and regulation and the Committee's role has been to identify areas of concern. It is anticipated that the next six months of meetings the Committee will make recommendations on process and regulation changes as well as continue to identify areas appropriate for change.

Staff requests the Committee provide staff feedback on whether or not the scope and focus of the agendas are meeting the Committees expectations. Comments should include identification of those agenda items that the Committee finds valuable and redirection on the items that the Committee finds having less value. Based on comments received by the Committee staff will make modifications to the work plan.