Planning Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

WESTBROOK AMENDMENT
Planning Commission Public Hearing
April 26, 2012, 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Audrey Huisking (Chair), Krista Bernasconi, Don Brewer, Sam Cannon, Robert Duggan, Gordon Hinkle, David Larson

Staff Present: Paul Richardson, Nela Luken, Chris Kraft, Kelye McKinney

The following is a summary of the questions and comments made at the public hearing.

Commissioner Bernasconi

1. Please tell us more about the schools.

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan, including Westbrook, has a significant area in the Center Unified School District, with the boundary as shown on the slide. When the plan was being reviewed we met with the Center District superintendent to discuss their need for facilities. The two elementary schools and the middle school located in the Center District portion were sized to accommodate all students from that portion of Sierra Vista including part of Westbrook. The two Roseville districts (elementary and high school) determined they needed an additional elementary school, in the middle of Westbrook, while their middle and high school students will be accommodated in schools in the West Plan.

Chair Huisking

2. There has been an issue with kids living across the street from each other but going to different schools. We don't want a neighborhood divided like that. Can we request in writing that the districts work this out?

A similar concern was expressed by the Planning Commission when considering Sierra Vista. The school districts said they would be willing to work together to find a solution for subdivisions that straddle the district boundary so that kids within a subdivision could go to the same school. The districts are amenable to find a solution that also balances average daily attendance for both districts. Staff will remind the districts that the Planning Commission again expressed the same concern with Westbrook, that children within a neighborhood attend the same school.

Commissioner Duggan

3. So to clarify about traffic impacts, the difference between what was already approved for Sierra Vista and now adding the Westbrook project amounts to no net increase.

Yes.

Commissioner Larson

4. I understand that traffic mitigation fees are collected to pay for road improvements. When will Blue Oaks Boulevard be widened from Highway 65 to Diamond Creek?

That can't be answered with a date certain. The City continuously monitors traffic conditions and level of service (LOS) at intersections. As demand increases along the corridor as a result of development and traffic monitoring shows that intersections are being stressed to reduced LOS, we schedule the improvements identified in our Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for construction. Monies required for the construction are those collected with our traffic mitigation fees at time of building permit issuance. Currently all intersections on Blue Oaks operate at LOS "A" except for Foothills-Blue Oaks which has a high left turn movement and a LOS "B". Both A and B are considered very good conditions that don't warrant capacity improvements.

5. What is the estimated percentage increase in the dependence on groundwater during drought years, for the Westbrook Amendment versus the Sierra Vista Specific Plan?

The analysis prepared for the Sierra Vista EIR used historic information which showed that drought conditions exist in 14 out of 100 years, or 14 percent of years. That has not changed so the dependence on groundwater has not increased.

6. Does the City have water contract resources available in the event we are unable to use groundwater? Does the City have a contingency plan?

The use of groundwater would only happen in dry or driest years, which would also be when our surface water supplies are reduced. The City's strategy for drought years starts with conservation. If we increase conservation to the point where demand is reduced by 35 percent, the City won't need to use groundwater. If we are in an emergency situation, the City has inter-ties with other agencies we can rely upon.

7. During the pilot Aquifer Storage and Recovery program, the taste of groundwater came as a shock. What about blending groundwater with surface water prior to consumption?

To be clear, Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) is not part of the Westbrook project. Blending was discussed in the EIR prepared for the ASR project. We determined it would be extraordinarily costly to construct new facilities to bring groundwater from the west side to the east side of town for blending. The City does not intend to construct new facilities or modify existing facilities for blending groundwater, which would be used in only 14 out of 100 years.

Chair Huisking

8. How far into the future are the City's water contracts with PCWA, San Juan, etc.? Could our contracts be adversely affected by state-wide water issues?

We recently executed a contract with Placer County Water Agency that consolidated all of our previous agreements and has terms of 20 to 30 years. Our agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation has been similar, but is currently on a year-to-year basis because of other contracts and things the Bureau needs to accomplish before they will sign a long-term contract. Typically, long-term contracts are 30 years. Regardless of state-wide issues, we are very confident that the City will get a new long-term contract, and the Bureau will not tell us we won't get the 32,000 acre-feet of our previous contract.

Commissioner Hinkle

9. Can we have an update on the buildout of Baseline Road to accommodate additional traffic? Do we have a time frame?

We do not have a time frame, as it's all based on development absorption. Improvements will be constructed incrementally as development occurs, which we anticipate progressing in an east to west direction. We do have some programmed improvements that will occur as the demand requires it, for instance the Watt-Santucci intersection. These programmed improvements are phased improvements

with the ultimate improvements anticipated as demand dictates. As the Sierra Vista Specific Plan develops adjacent to Baseline, frontage improvements will be constructed along with the interim improvements required to meet the traffic demands.

10. What's the relationship between the City's and County's responsibility for Baseline?

The City works closely with Placer County and other agencies on regional roads. There is currently a joint traffic mitigation fee program between Placer County and the City that collects funds for regional improvements, including Baseline Road. Placer County has approved the Placer Vineyards project, located on the south side of Baseline, which shares in the responsibility to construct portions of the Baseline frontage improvements adjacent to that project site.