

# Meeting Notes

## Valley Springs Community Plan Update Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 5, 2009

6:00 – 7:30 PM

United Methodist Church, 135 Laurel Street  
Valley Springs, CA

- I. Welcome
- II. Recent Events
  - A. RC Clubhouse meeting
  - B. Direct Mailer to RC Prop. Owners
  - C. Development of LU/Circulation Maps
- III. Updates
  - A. County Staffing changes
  - B. GP Coordinator position recruitment
  - C. GP Alternatives
- IV. Planning Process Issues
  - A. GP and CP process timing
  - B. Conflicting messages
- V. Outreach
  - A. SAC as “Ambassadors”
  - B. Group Brainstorm

### I. Welcome

Tyler Summersett opened the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting and thanked all of the SAC members for their continued participation in the process.

There was a question from one of the Stakeholders regarding EDAW, the consulting firm hired for the project, pertaining to how they were selected.

Tyler explained the RFP, Interview, and Evaluation processes.

### II. Recent Events

A. RC Clubhouse meeting- CCOG Staff and County staff attended a meeting hosted by a member of the SAC who lives in RC. The meeting was originally to be part of the Project Partners outreach effort to speak specifically to issues of concern to Rancho Calaveras. Some of the prominent discussion items were in relation to the RC Special Plan, tax assessments, and Property Rights. Due to complications in the planning

process, the SAC member coordinated the meeting, set the agenda, and served as the facilitator for the meeting. CCOG and County were present in an ancillary role only.

CCOG and County staff shared the following information with participants: there is no conflict between the Rancho Calaveras Special Plan and being included within a Community Plan boundary, there will be no new tax assessments associated with the Community Plan, and there are no Land Use changes proposed within the RC Special Plan area.

B. Direct Mailer to RC Prop. Owners- A letter was mailed to each parcel owner within Rancho Calaveras from the Executive Director of the CCOG delineating the separate issues of concern (as identified by residents) and offering an explanation of how the concern was addressed in the Valley Springs Community Plan (VSCP) process. A copy of the letter was shared with SAC members.

C. Development of LU/Circulation Maps- Tyler shared that EDAW had developed the first draft of the VSCP LU and Circulation Maps. The maps were being shared with the County to be sure they were consistent with land use designations and County Policy being employed for the GP update. The maps had originally been anticipated to be ready to share with the Community for a November workshop.

- SAC member asked what is included in the VSCP maps.

Tyler stated that the community plan maps would cover existing and proposed changes to Land Use designations in the community and a Circulation map to serve the Community. Tim further clarified that the maps were supposed to be a reflection of the information collected from the Community workshops in May/June/August.

The maps were also a product of Interim County policy encouraging density where infrastructure exists (ie, Community Centers).

- SAC member asked about the timing of the release of the Map.

The Project Partners will first notify affected Property Owners of Draft Land Use Map, prior to release of the map to the community.

- SAC member asks if the County GP update process will notify property owners of proposed Land Use designation changes?

To the best of the Project Partner knowledge this will not happen.

There was a short discussion which ensued regarding the implications of proposed LU designations.

### III. Updates

A. County staffing changes- The Planning department hired a new Director, George White. Previously, he worked for the City of Petaluma. Shaelyn Strattan, County Planner and VSCP project liaison no longer works with Planning Department.

B. GP Coordinator--The County has made it public that they are seeking to fill the vacant General Plan Coordinator position.

C. GP Alternatives- The County is working towards the release of the Alternatives analysis for the GP update.

- There was a question from a SAC member regarding the number of meetings that will be held as part of the GP update? A concern about the “transparency” of the process.

Tim McSorley shared that he anticipated there would very likely be many opportunities for input into the process as it continues to unfold. Tim also explained that he hoped for continued coordination between the two planning documents (GP and CP) as the efforts moved forward. He reflected on previous guidance from the BOS to communities to prepare plans for their communities. He highlighted a unique feature of VSCP process, the grant award (VS one of the only communities with \$\$ to create plan).

- A SAC member asked about the folks whom are just now hearing about the VSCP and/or live outside the proposed boundary?

Every effort is made to bring new community members up to speed with what has already transpired as part of the planning process. Those members of the community who are not included in the Valley Springs Community Plan will be part of the Countywide General Plan update.

- A member of the Public questioned if enough Rancho Calaveras residents knew what the VSCP update is proposing?
- A SAC member shared that they are not an advocate of inclusion/exclusion of RC, however, he recognizes the Circulation benefits of including the subdivision.
- A member of the public stated they believe that every land owner in RC should receive a ballot so they can vote on whether or not they want to be included in the new Plan.
- A SAC member asked if the August 27<sup>th</sup> meeting was video-recorded. From his recollection there was input and discussion from both sides (folks who agreed with the selection of Boundary C and those who had lobbied against inclusion) and that based on the feedback from the Community the Project Partners are moving forward responsibly.

- A public member stated that you can't have a Plan within a Plan!  
Tim McSorley respectfully disagreed.

#### IV. Planning Process Issues

A. General Plan and Community Plan process timing—It was shared that currently the development of the Community Plan seemed to be ahead of the GP process. There are elements of this timing that are good, as it relates to the Project Partners ability to submit the Plan to the County prior to beginning the environmental document for the GP.

Conflicting Messages--Tyler relayed that a contributing complication to the Planning process is mis-information that is being combated by the Project Partners. There is also a palpable lack of trust in Government exhibited by a small segment of the area, many of which do not live within the Planning boundary.

#### V. Outreach

A. SAC as “Ambassadors”-Tyler shared his hope that each of the SAC members would assist where possible in helping to advertise public workshops and encourage community members to participate in the process.

##### B. Group Brainstorm-

- A SAC member suggested that two timelines be created, one illustrating the GP update schedule and one showing the timeline for the VSCP and additionally demonstrate where the two are intending to overlap. Furthermore, the SAC member mentioned that Rancho Calaveras needed to have some identified avenue out of the Community Plan.
- There was a suggestion from a member of the Public to hold the next public workshops in mid-January.
- A SAC member suggested that if we advertise a “vote” at the next community meeting we will get better participation from the Community. The SAC member continued, explaining there was no way to verify the results of the “clicker” vote and suggested that any future votes be done by show of hands, etc.
- The Caltrans representative shared that any allegations challenging the results (of the “clicker” vote taken on Aug. 27) as having been falsified are wishful thinking and have no logic because Caltrans is looking at continued Community feedback regarding the Draft boundary and are hoping for movement towards greater consensus.

Tim McSorley wanted to reframe the idea that a “vote” needs to be taken as part of the process. Community Plans are governed by General Plan (State) law and do not require a direct vote of unincorporated community members. Instead, Tim suggests the “vote” be considered an “expression of opinion”.

- A SAC member stated that they were concerned that the process was catering too much to the Rancho Calaveras property owners, maybe to the detriment of the project.

Some ideas for effective continued outreach included:

- CCTV
- Station 9
- Ice Cream truck (w/ catchy tune) distributing information
- Local Radio spots

No exact dates have been determined for the next public workshops

Meeting concluded