

STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

135 Laurel Street, Valley Springs

United Methodist Church

June 23rd, 2009

6:00 - 7:30 pm

Summary:

The third advisory committee meeting was held with staff from LGC, CCOG, MyValleySprings.com, Calaveras County and EDAW to review the community design workshops and outcomes and plan for the project next steps. Staff from CCOG gave an overview of upcoming events, anticipated schedule, and asked for feedback regarding the May 28 – June 2 events. EDAW led discussion about how to approach the build-out analysis and proposed next activities to establish direction for the community plan. The group decided that it would be beneficial to hold several stakeholder focus meetings (CCWD/VSPUD, Property owners, Developers), work together on potential community plan boundary alternatives for review by the larger community, and to have materials prepared to explain the reasons, benefits and implications of a community plan. The next SAC meeting is planned for later in July to review outcomes of the build-out analysis and determine issues to address at the next community workshop, expected to take place in late August or early September.

Agenda

- I. Introductions and Sign-in
- II. Upcoming Events
 - July 28 Meeting
 - Meeting ground rules
- III. May 28 – June 2 Charrette Review
- IV. July 28 Workshop
 - Build-out analysis
 - Community plan
 - New focus meetings
 - Community consensus
- V. Open Discussion/Feedback
- VI. Next Series of Community Meetings
- VII. Public Comment

May 28 – June 2 Charrette Review

Tyler asked the group to give their impressions of the charrette process, what worked, what didn't, what needs to be improved. Comments are below.

- Use of the school was difficult - lighting, sound, kids, needed to be more tightly organized; use of maps was good, engaged people; group activities on Saturday were good.

- Needed more time for discussion on the last day. Too much to go over.
- Not enough time to look at the maps, what they meant, what is changed, especially for landowners, e.g., down-zoning to agriculture. Intersection and bypass – 2 traffic issues – short-term and long-term vision for how to get cars off the intersection. Need to be concerned about the viability of ranchland. Ag pieces that aren't too small. Need to plan better for commercial; concerned with reduction of commercially zoned property. Also concerned about zoning where infrastructure doesn't exist (water and sewer).
- Fire, sheriff, CHP – need better roads for better access – e.g, problem of ditches next to two-lane roads; need access to homes, too.
- Problem of shifting commercial to residential – need more mixed use to add to Town Center access.
- Would like to see segments from first round dealt with in smaller breakout sessions (for future community workshops /events) – shorter segments with more activities.
- Need to address infrastructure. Problem of moving existing spray-field could take out other Ag land.
- CCWD has a sewer master plan (AD604), located where we should be expanding, where services are needed in the future, looks 20 years out, updated every 5 years. Need to find out where we can serve economically. Affects everybody.
- Who put map forward that includes Wallace and Burson? These communities will end up paying for things in Valley Springs.
- New people kept coming to the meetings. Need to bring people up to speed. Confused about jargon (do a better job of explaining vocabulary, concepts). Not everyone understands what the outcome will be (of the planning process) or the terminology. Not sure how this process relates to decisions people will need to make or understand.
- Problem of all traffic being funneled through one 4-way stop (Hwy's 12/26); have 700 acres (where?) that can be used for a bypass.
- Could extend Paloma Road. Build a grid pattern, network.
- Haven't addressed Cosgrove Creek flood control.
- Need to establish boundaries so people know who are affected and can come forward with any concerns/questions they may have.

July 28 Workshop

Build-out Analysis

Jeff Henderson of EDAW gave an overview of what was planned for the next community workshop. He explained the buildout analysis – based on allowable land uses today, projected out into the future using existing zoning. Comments and discussion points are below.

Why not just work with willing partners (Need outreach with landowner representatives. Actually talking to people who own the land, what they would like to do)? Why do a baseline with existing zoning?

One of the goals of the additional focus group meetings will be to sit down with Developers and Land owners to do just this---work with those who are willing partners in the process. Those with applications in the pipeline or hopes of developing also bring with them the means to finance infrastructure improvements. The Build-out Analysis will show that what looks like open space now may have underlying zoning that will allow lots of development (ie, what is perceived to currently be ‘open space’ is, in fact, un-built parcels which could be developed at any time).

There are already lots of land splits in Burson/Wallace area – can get these off of assessors maps.

Jeff Henderson explained that EDAW is aware of the Assessor parcel maps and will use them as part of the analysis for creating the 3-5 build-out scenarios.

Valley Springs already is a township?

True. The community plan update will allow an opportunity to further delineate values and desires of this township- to a much more detailed degree than can be addressed in the Countywide General Plan. It will also allow an opportunity to make changes to land use designations and community boundaries to meet community goals.

Already have a defined nucleus. Existing town (12/26). If the existing town center were determined to no longer be downtown, could a new one be considered?

The existing Town Center does not necessarily have to remain the historic portion of Valley Springs. An alternate vision could be developed as part of this process, which respects the old area, like a Murphy’s model downtown, though people go there to buy candles, not groceries.

Community Plan

Jeff Henderson asked if the group thought it would be effective to have 3 to 5 alternatives with boundaries for people to consider?

Jeff Henderson led discussion about what was needed for folks who live in the planning area to better understand the reasons for a community plan. He offered a draft list of FAQ's for feedback and additions.

Where should the community 'build out' to? What direction to go?

Possible inclusion of infrastructure costs?

Will we consider jobs as well as homes? Will it help entice jobs?

Have a section as part of the Q&A to address alternatives to encourage businesses to come, e.g., around the (proposed Delta CC) campus.

Include enough detail to know so folks understand what trade-offs the alternatives represent. Need description next to map, information, what the cost-benefits are.

Overlay alternatives where existing infrastructure is?

Comments from the SAC

Much discussion ensued about what needs to go into developing boundary alternatives and share with advisory committee before a community workshop.
Comments included:

Members of the advisory committee pointed out the importance of meeting with property owners and the water district. Need to get input from additional stakeholder groups.

Schedule focus meetings with:

- Property owners and large landowners
- Development project applicants or potential applicants
- Water and sewer infrastructure – CCWD/VSPUD

Need to have shaded areas with intent from water agency to serve – existing and proposed.

Zoning is already done for the town center, so just need to decide how precisely to do it.

What about hwy 26 and 12? Need more shoulders – room for bike paths.

The highway is a 1930s highway. The shoulders are narrow, and although road-bikes currently use both State facilities, current design standards accommodate multiple user groups.

Should include measurements to show placement/distance of sub-areas within the community plan boundaries from the town center. Within each proposed boundary, show the “centroid” (the population center) and identify distances from that point by ½ and 1 mile radiuses.

Still have the problem of representation from Valley Springs proper. Not enough representation from old Valley Springs.

Need to talk with utility districts first before putting boundaries out for review.

What about school district boundaries?

Need to have an infrastructure meeting beforehand.

Open Discussion

No additional comments to report.

Schedule Next Meeting

- Next SAC meeting: Thursday, July 16 or Thursday, July 23.
- CCOG will try to arrange infrastructure meetings (CCWD/VSPUD) in mid-July.
- Next community workshop will be scheduled for late August or early September.