

Valley Springs Community Plan Public Workshop
Thursday, August 27, 2009
Valley Springs Elementary School
6:00 - 8:30 PM

- Future Growth Projections
- What it means to be in a Community Plan
- Community Plan Boundary Alternatives

Workshop Notes

The workshop began at 6:15. 180 people signed in.

Tyler Summersett of the Calaveras County Council of Governments (CCOG) welcomed everyone to the meeting and established ground rules for the night's meeting and posted them up front:

- Respect each other and differing opinions
- Raise hands
- Only 1 speaker at a time
- Stay on subject
- Be as concise as possible
- Return your clicker (electronic polling device)

Jeff Henderson and Jeff Goldman of EDAW/AECOM gave a presentation and facilitated public input exercises using individual electronic polling devices. Breaks for questions were provided in between segments of the presentation.

Participants were asked warm-up questions to test the polling devices and learn about who was in the room and how they heard about the workshop. The polling devices enabled responses to be tabulated and presented momentarily back to the participants throughout the evening.

Q&A followed regarding the purpose of the project and night's activities (questions are in italics):

What is happening with the 12/26 bypass? Public Works has hired a firm to evaluate traffic control alternatives at the intersection and complete the design of the preferred alternative.

Why build any more subdivisions? Just fill in Rancho Calaveras. What about the 1,000 un-built lots in there? We're not planning Rancho, but the remaining build-out potential will come out of the build-out analysis.

Are we getting a Save Mart? We don't know about that particular store, but you could plan for desired shopping and services in the community plan.

The Hogan Dam road and Highway 26 intersection also has intersection concerns like 12/26. Will you be looking at that? Yes, these are the types of traffic issues that will be addressed in the plan

What is the logic for not showing a boundary option that runs down Highway 12 west? That question may be answered in the boundary components section of the presentation that is following this question and answer period.

Jeff Henderson reviewed the results of the public process to date and discussed the purpose of a community plan. He noted that many questions may be answered in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) sheet that was handed out to participants as they signed in for the workshop and that the document could be downloaded from the CCOG web site. Questions that followed included:

What will happen to the Rancho Calaveras Special Plan if Rancho is part of the community plan? The Special Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and any changes to that plan would have to be decided by them. Also, the community plan would not create or change any assessment district.

The boundary lines shown on the various maps don't seem to correspond to property lines. These lines are approximate and we will talk about them more when we get into the boundary alternatives discussion in the next segment.

How long will the community plan last? Typically the life of these plans is 20 to 30 years; roughly the length of a generation.

Concern was raised based on the notes from a July 30 Advisory Committee meeting that the Rancho Calaveras Special Plan would be changed by the community plan. Regardless of the notes from that meeting changes could not be made without a vote of the Board of Supervisors.

Is the area known as AD 604 shown in the community plan study area? Yes

A public comment was made that the plan area should be big as possible to limit growth.

Will the Community Plan Update be done in time to be included in the General Plan Update? We are trying to prepare the Plan in tandem with the General Plan Update so that it can be included, but we don't know for sure yet how the exact timing of the two processes will converge.

What about the industrial zone outside San Andreas coming down to Toyon? This issue can be addressed in the countywide general plan, as Toyon is not part of the proposed Valley Springs Community Plan area.

Will the Community Plan be changed if it is part of the General Plan? It will be a part of and has to be consistent with the General Plan. As long as it is consistent, then it may not require change. The Supervisors could approve changes as they consider the document for approval.

Will the plan distinguish between industrial and mixed commercial uses? We will begin to address Land Use in the discussion of boundary alternatives that is coming up and in greater detail in later workshops where the focus will be on proposed land uses.

A concern was raised that there was not enough representation from those who live within the current Valley Springs Community Plan area and that decisions would be made on their behalf.

A comment was made that there have been 15 updates to the current Valley Springs Community Plan since it was first adopted. The land use maps have been amended in these updates. However, the text of the community plan has not been updated.

A concern was raised about maintaining the right to farm in the area.

Jeff Henderson presented the results of the build-out analysis prepared by EDAW showing the maximum potential for new residential units with existing zoning under the existing Community Plan and current County General Plan. Comments and questions ensued, including:

- The amount of development shown would never happen given the limitations of infrastructure. Jeff noted the analysis is only intended to show what is allowable under current regulations, not necessarily what will actually happen.
- A participant noted that development was being taken into consideration in a wider area than the subject area for the community plan.
- A comment was raised that the development density shown in the build-out map density was not sufficient to serve with surface water, so water would need to be obtained from groundwater sources and could intensify the trend toward groundwater overdraft (more water being used than replenished).

The workshop moved on to the boundary alternatives discussion. Jeff Henderson explained how the various components were developed and noted considerations associated with each component.

A question was asked about *what constitutes high fire hazard areas?* The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) defines the fire hazard severity zones.

Another question was asked, “*would the community plan create an assessment district?*” Jeff Goldman explained that it would not. Another participant noted that Rancho Calaveras is in a

high fire hazard area, but people voted not to have things like sidewalks, lights, and wider streets (built to county standards).

Jeff Henderson introduced six boundary alternatives that were created using different combinations of the components that would provide a basis for establishing the community plan boundary. The purpose was to present a broad spectrum of community plan boundary options. Participants were then asked to express their preferences for a boundary using the clickers.

Several rounds of voting were conducted, with the results as follows:

First Vote – All 6 Alternatives:

128 votes, Alternative C received the highest number, 47% of the total. Boundary B received 17%; Boundary E received 11%, Boundary A received 9%; Boundary D received 9%; and Boundary F received 6%.

Second Vote – Alternatives B, C, E

124 votes, Alternative C received the highest number, 54%. B received 24% and E received 21%.

Third Vote – Alternatives B and C

100 votes, Alternative C received the highest number, 52%. B received 48%.

Fourth Vote – Alternatives C and E

105 votes, Alternative C received the highest number, 57%. E received 43%.

It was decided that the planning effort would move forward using Alternative C as the preliminary boundary.