EL DORADO COUNTY GRAND JURY 2013-2014

COUNTY ACTIONS CREATE FLOODING, COUNTY NO HELP WITH REPAIR
Case Number GJ-13-17

Reason for Report

Two property owners adjacent to the Granada Heights subdivision in Cameron Park complained that each time there is substantial rain, their properties are heavily flooded and eroded. They assert the flooding is a result of: (1) installation of an apparent speed bump by the Granada Heights Homeowners Association (HOA) which actually diverts storm water runoff to a drainage swale that was not originally designed to handle it; and (2) enlargement of a side yard and alteration of the same drainage swale by a property owner uphill of the complainants that was approved by the HOA and the County. The alteration changed the swale, a rock lined ditch, into a concrete sidewalk that greatly reduced the storm water capacity while increasing its velocity.

Summary

The investigation revealed many incidents that ultimately contributed to the complaint. The complainants had every expectation that the County would assist in solving the significant drainage problems the County created when failing to thoroughly review either the original drainage design for Granada Heights or its alteration by the HOA and a property owner. To the complainants’ surprise, and significant cost, the County denied any responsibility for the problem, putting the burden of correcting it on the property owners, despite the County’s failure to correctly administer the County Code.

In reality, the County failed to protect neighboring property owners from the increased storm water flows by allowing them to happen and continued to deny relief assistance of any kind due to their flawed record keeping.

Background

1990
The revised Granada Heights subdivision was approved by the County.

July 2002
The HOA installed what appears to be a speed bump that acts as a diverter, redirecting storm water onto Granada Court and to a rock lined drainage easement not designed to handle the additional flow and then to a complainants’ property.

March 2004
El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) Maintenance Division cleared a culvert on Granada Court after a complaint of flooding, demonstrating that DOT accepted maintenance responsibility for that street.

**June 2005**
The Granada Heights HOA approved a property owner’s plan to enlarge his side yard adjacent to a rock lined primary drainage swale. He extended his side yard into the drainage swale by constructing a retaining wall reducing the drainage swale to a 3 ft. concrete sidewalk with a 6” curb. This both reduced the drainage capacity and increased the velocity of flowing water.

**November 2005**
The property owner submitted and the County approved a plot plan for the retaining wall although it did not address drainage. The County review of the plan did not address drainage either.

**December 2005**
The complainants’ properties were flooded and the newly installed retaining wall, with an incomplete curb, was undermined.

**January 2006**
A complainant notified DOT Maintenance of flooding and silt/erosion on their property. DOT maintenance reported that eroded silt and rocks from the incomplete concrete curb had clogged a storm pipe at the rear of the complainants’ properties causing flooding.

**July 2006**
The County decided that the drainage problems were a civil matter that should be resolved between the property owners.

**December 2006**
DOT incorrectly determined that an unrelated property owner was responsible for the obstruction and demanded that the drainage ditch improperly installed on that property be reinstalled. This parcel owner hired an attorney and the County dropped its demand when it was determined that the drainage ditch never existed on this property.

**March 2007**
Subsequently, DOT demanded that the property owner who did alter the drainage ditch properly size a pipe he illegally placed on a neighbor’s property. The Assessor’s Parcel Number referred to in the DOT letter could not be found to exist.

**February 2008**
The complainants estimated the costs for repairs to and mitigation of the drainage problem at more than $25,000.
August 2008
The County informed the complainant they could not find a drainage plan for Granada Heights.

2009
The complainants sued the HOA. The property owner and management company subsequently settled.

December 13, 2013
The County Community Development Agency, Transportation Division, stated in a letter to the complainant that “they (the property owner that enlarged his front yard and altered the drainage swale) may have miscalculated the actual velocity of the runoff in the concrete swale and the infrastructure necessary to safely move the run off through the property”, and that “additional calculations and modifications to the concrete swale” might be necessary to return the flow to pre-concrete velocity.

The County also suggested an existing pipe system in an El Dorado Irrigation District easement at complainants’ rear yards may also be inadequate. The letter goes on to say that it is the complainants’ responsibility to discuss the need for any change with neighbors.

Actions

- The complainants were interviewed.
- Representatives of the County Building Department, Department of Transportation and Air Quality Management District were interviewed.
- County records were reviewed.
- The County FINAL Revised Grading Ordinance, 2-5-07 (Ordinance #4716) Revised 8-10-10 (Ordinance #4949) was reviewed.

Discussion

Although there were neighborhood and civil engineering concerns about the drainage of the revised subdivision of Granada Heights, the County approved the project in 1990. The County's analysis of internal and external drainage was flawed; flooding of the subdivision and adjacent properties has since occurred resulting in damages to the complainants.

From 2004 to 2013, the County has been aware of, has been in communication with, and acted upon complaints from numerous parties regarding the flooding of these properties.
The HOA of Granada Heights subdivision installed a speed bump to divert water from their development to a drainage swale. The County subsequently made matters worse by rubber stamping a private property owner's desire to make his yard bigger and not analyzing the impacts of alterations to the drainage. Investigations by the County indicate that a critical drainage ditch that could have alleviated run off to a nearby creek did not, in fact, actually exist.

The mantra the Grand Jury has heard repeatedly from County officials that it is the will of the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) to be customer friendly. Unfortunately, in this case, their customer friendly attitude coupled with lack of proper plan checking and application of county ordinances, caused collateral damage.

The complainants had every right to believe and expect that the County would assist in solving the significant drainage problems created when the County failed to thoroughly review either the original drainage design for Granada Heights or its alteration by the HOA and a property owner. To their surprise, and significant cost, the County denied any responsibility for the problem, putting the burden of correcting it on the property owners, despite the County's failure to do its duty and administer the County Code causing their damage originally.

**Findings**

1. The complainants’ properties are flooded from runoff when there is substantial rain; causing erosion on their properties.

   **Response:** Respondent cannot agree or disagree with the finding. There is no evidence the flooding issues have not been rectified. The Grand Jury report states that there was a civil settlement agreement between the “property owner and management company.”

2. The internal and external drainage analysis of the Granada Heights revised subdivision was flawed. The County should not have approved this revised subdivision.

   **Response:** Respondent disagrees with the finding. The flooding issue is described by the complainants as a result of either a speed bump in the road and/or enlargement of a side yard. By this context, the subdivision as approved and built in 1990 was not flawed, but according to complainants improvements added later created a problem in 2005.

3. Deficiencies in County record keeping prevented County staff from locating the drainage plan for Granada Heights. Staff relied on an as built subdivision plan showing
a drainage swale that, in fact, did not exist, leading to a claim against the wrong property owner. That property owner was forced to hire an attorney to defend against the mistaken claim.

Response: Respondent disagrees with the finding. The County relies on the subdivision as built plans as the only true evidence of the subdivision original construction.

4. The County illegally permitted the installation of a retaining wall and alteration of a drainage swale without requiring the analysis and plans required by its own regulations.

Response: Respondent disagrees with the finding. The installation of a retaining wall was completed under proper building permit (168046) including supporting documentation from registered professional engineer Ronald S. Illium, AEI Engineering, Folsom, consistent with the Building Code and Grading Ordinance.

5. The County has admitted that the velocity of the water in the altered drainage swale and improper sizing of a pipe in an EID easement have contributed to the drainage, flooding, and erosion problems.

Response: Respondent disagrees with the finding. The finding is not supported by any documentation in the Grand Jury report or in the County files.

6. The County has the authority to remediate the harm done to the complainants and others similarly affected. The El Dorado County FINAL Revised Grading Ordinance, 2-5-07, Section 15.14.410, Corrective work, subsection A., Abatement of unlawfully created conditions allows the director to

…order County workers or contractors to immediately enter private property to conduct work necessary to abate hazards to public health and safety such as: a. The alteration of drainage patterns that has caused, or has the potential to cause, flooding of or siltation upon any downstream property…

It further states

2. Cost recovery: Whenever the County expends any funds or takes any action, the County shall bill the landowner, lessee or licensee for the costs indicated herein. Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 54988, the costs shall become a lien on the property, or shall be recoverable from the property owner by other legal means.

Response: The respondent disagrees in part with the finding. The County has authority to protect the public health and safety but has prosecutorial discretion when
implementing code enforcement actions. In the matter of the flooding, it was
determined to be primarily a civil matter.

Recommendations

1. The County should analyze, or cause to have analyzed, the existing drainage of
Granada Court, Granada Heights and surrounding properties and any drainage
methods and devices within public right-of-way and private and public easements to
determine their adequacy to properly convey storm runoff sufficiently to avert flooding
and erosion of private property. Upon completion of such analysis, the county should
install corrective measures in the public right of way and private and public easements
to correct any deficiencies.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not
warranted.

2. The Director of Development Services should require County employees to apply the
requirements of the Grading Ordinance.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented.

3. Prior to issuance of any permit, the County should thoroughly analyze the impacts on
drainage by requiring the applicant to adhere to the specific requirements of the
Grading Ordinance.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented.

4. If it is determined that application of the Grading Ordinance in some cases is
particularly onerous to some property owners, the Director of Development Services
should study such cases and, with input from stakeholders, recommend appropriate
exemptions.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented.

5. The County should more aggressively implement the provisions of the Grading
Ordinance cited above to restore properties to the condition existing before illegal
grading and construction occurred and bill the landowner, lessee or licensee for costs.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not
warranted.