

12/17/2009

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

6:00-8:30 PM

Jenny Lind School, Library

Project Partners

CCOG: Tim McSorley, Tyler Summersett

LGC: Josh Meyer

MVS.com: Mark Jones, Colleen Platt, Joyce Techel, Muriel Zeller

County: Robert Pachinger (PW)

Consultant

AECOM: Jeff Goldman, Joshua Lathan

Meeting notes and activities*

Jeff Goldman introduced the draft land use diagram and broadly described new code designations CCR and CCH. He explained RR-RC khaki color, which represents Rancho Special Plan area, and is not being changed; the Community Plan will refer reader to the Special Plan document with more detail. Josh Lathan pointed out differences from the current County General Plan.

Questions ensued regarding change of industrial designations to other types in the draft diagram. Participants raised the importance of industry for tax base and jobs. Concern was raised as to whether changing industrial to Ag designation on Coe property would hinder the possibility of attracting a community college satellite campus. Jeff Goldman noted that commercial designations on the draft plan allow for a mix of uses and would likely accommodate what many people would consider light industrial development.

A participant asked if the plan would bring commercial development into Rancho Calaveras. Goldman answered no. The question was asked why include Rancho Calaveras in the plan. Goldman answered because a majority of people at the August workshop responded that it should be included and that Rancho residents are an important consumer base and are impacted by services and circulation in the area; and that leaving out the largest customer base and circulation impact would not lead to the best community plan.

Why wasn't every resident in Rancho Calaveras contacted to come to the charrette? Tyler Summersett noted extensive efforts by the project partners to notify and involve all residents and stakeholders of the greater Valley Springs area.

A participant said proof was needed in writing to guarantee that the Rancho Calaveras Special Plan would not be changed by the community plan. Jeff Goldman said the Special Plan is a legal document

adopted by the County and won't change; it may be appropriate to have language in the VSCP saying the Special Plan does not change; the plans can be side-by-side.

Concern was raised that it was too late to do anything about the Plan . . . that it would be completed in January. Response was that the project has deviated from original schedule, and schedule will be extended to allow time to continue Planning process.

A participant pointed out that a development application for a property near the town center that he was aware of, was not reflected on the LU Map. Other questions were raised regarding proposed land use changes and designation of new road alignments.

- A participant pointed out land use changes:
 - town center, what does RL allow
 - Lime Creek Road
 - AG is not the same as AG preserve- is there a GP designation for AG preserve?
 - Map details are not good enough to know on whose property circulation improvements will occur.
 - Tyler noted that Land Use diagrams are to reflect community and County policy direction and are not meant to be parcel-specific. The focus should be on whether the draft map represents values that the community has shared:
 - Are we showing designations that depict the general sense of what we want as a community?
 - e.g., a compact town center commercial area or commercial development strung along SR 26?
 - Jeff also noted that alignments for a 12/26 bypass have already been studied by Caltrans and ultimate alignments could vary. Corridors are identified, not specific alignments- especially for circulation improvements- alignments will be determined by future studies.
- Need a description of land use designations- what can occur here?
- Need a map showing the changes that are proposed to occur- through shading areas of change?
 - Show what's proposed in the diagram that's different from existing designation or the difference between GP nomenclatures (existing vs. update designations).
- Where are the provisions for an updated sewer/water treatment plant? What does PS-- Public Service mean? Where is the access to the public land (the large PS designation on the draft map)?

- VS downtown is boxed in by AG land and if it wants to grow in the future it can't because it doesn't have anywhere to go.
- Check the blue square shown in La Contenta on the map – in the proper location?
- Define existing sewer treatment area/plant in VS on the map.
- Maybe we don't want to have sewer plants in downtown VS. Put PS designation in outer areas?
- Regarding outreach to Rancho Calaveras, instead of putting all signs in VS, put some in Rancho where people will see them.
 - Tyler has already spoken with the individual who brought this concern up. He will put a sign on Baldwin as suggested for the next Community workshop.
- Where are the plans/ideas for 12/26? We've heard they are forthcoming, but what are they? Do you plan to widen them? They're dangerous. You can't get people to come in and live here if you can't avoid the accidents that are already occurring. This is critical to bringing business into the county.
 - Tim pointed out that design work has not yet started for the Caltrans-funded 12/26 improvement plan; for now this is the infrastructure we have to deal with.
- Community's have strength only through their economies. We only have space for retail and low-wage jobs. Where's the economic backbone so people can stay in the county for well-paid jobs?
 - E.g., space for Intel, Pixar, or similar employers to locate in Valley Springs.
 - This plan offers no opportunity to grow an economy because there's no industrial designation:
 - It's true that the diagram does not currently include any heavy industrial.
 - Industrial doesn't mean we are resource based- there are plenty of industrial uses that are not extractive.
- What we don't have is an availability of water/sewer services. We will also need to expand fire/police/schools/etc. Who will pay for this growth of service demand?
- Are we too far ahead of the County General Plan update to be doing this community plan right now? We don't have land use descriptions from the County, or where roads are going.
- Where will the high density residential go that is described in the grant?
 - "CCR" is mixed use and can accommodate this potential if there is demand and market; this was part of the vision for the Town Center.

- You've already removed commercial along 26 – the Shell gas station, driving range with restaurant, mini-storage, next to the body shop – the infrastructure is already in place for that which it is designed for. Maybe keep a commercial corridor along the west side of 26 because it's already designed for that. Response was keeping entire corridor could dilute activity and not maintain demand. Further concern expressed that plan is not listing "as-built" commercial.
- Is there an economic feasibility study for the VS area or for the County?
 - This hasn't been done.
- Why designate PR in the middle of the CCR area? Why not make development conditions that say this area needs to be developed as a park in the future?
 - The park doesn't necessarily need to be a park per se, but during the charrette it was identified that people want a cultural area/recreation amenity in the Town Center area.
 - It would be nice to have a walking community design for the town center, maybe not one big park only.
- Will you have it more together for the public meeting in January to show not what might happen but what will happen?
 - This is our first cut, at the meeting we'll gather feedback to refine this map.
- We should address safety issues between the motel and golf course where the road is windy and hilly- some times of the day the sun is right in your eyes and creates dangerous driving conditions.
- Rancho was originally planned with a 4-lane highway on 26, but that idea was abandoned.
- Showing so many designations limits people's understanding of this diagram, narrows the focus, and will raise concerns. Could there be fewer colors and broader definitions of designations so it seems less set in stone?
 - E.g., we think commercial should go in this framework, but it's not limited to those areas only; be more vague or open ended.
 - If these designations don't do what we want to do, maybe we need additional designations.
 - Don't take this map to the BOS because it doesn't have definitions.
 - If we can't give sample draft explanations to explain what we're saying, we'll lose trust and miss an opportunity to make progress- the first charrette was clearer, more logical- if we move forward like this, people will be confused and will not provide feedback that we seek.
 - At the last planning commission meeting, George White said there will be GP info available to public in the first 2 months of new year.

- Is there a way to simplify this map so the general public can understand what the broad scope of possibilities is?
 - Residential low doesn't paint a picture in people's minds. Instead of letters use pictograms (clustered houses, apartments, barn, etc.).
- Somebody went around with other Rancho residents to take a poll on who wanted to be in the community plan and over 200 said no, only 5 said yes- so the outreach is not working if this has been going on for a year. A participant responded that meetings are always in the paper—some people don't read the paper.
- The community at large doesn't know the existing land uses.
- We need to take our time before we put this map out there to get it right (e.g., hotel, etc); make a lot of corrections.
 - The group is voicing that more work needs to be done before this diagram is ready for public meeting.
 - Maybe this process could benefit from greater County clarity regarding new LU designations and what they mean.
- The college wants to come out here and if we change land from industrial to agriculture they'll think we're stupid and might change their mind.
 - Nobody would invest in a community where land use designations can be changed so easily and government can take land value away.
- Tim McSorley - we need to do more work on this diagram, reconvene this group before going to public.
 - Need map showing existing land use designations.
 - Better clarity on what colors mean.
 - Clarity on what existing uses are.
 - If we haven't heard from you, please get in touch with COG to share your comments on what changes need to be included.
- Tyler- additional considerations for the Community Plan as it relates to the County GP process?
 - Impacts of CP analyzed in County environmental document---could be jeopardized
- We need good clarification from our Supervisors regarding the meaning of the interim policy document.

- In addition to other maps, we need some way to show our justification for why changes were made or designations were chosen.
 - Need to do that for all areas that are changing.
- Water being supplied comes from New Hogan Reservoir- and we're having a 5-year drought- if you want commercial, housing, and density to happen, you need additional water sources.
 - CCWD says can serve AD604. What is the cost?
 - We actually have water rights from New Hogan and we use only a fraction of it- if we don't start using more, then we will lose our rights and won't be able to grow in the future. Question raised about low levels currently in New Hogan.
- Tyler wrap up:
 - Need to do more work on maps, then meet with SAC again, which means we postpone the January meeting.
 - New maps should show current permitted uses and future proposed uses.
- Can we make a map that just shows Ag, Res, and CDA (core development area that would include commercial, PS, PR, CCR, CCH, etc.)?
 - Are we conforming to the County, or are we telling them what we want, even if that means we need to create our own designations?
 - Maybe we can add to the County's LU definitions to make sure we get everything included that we want (walking trails in commercial areas, etc.).
- Is there a financial statement regarding how this money is being spent and how much is left- you're getting public funds and I think that you're required to report this information.
 - I also think this meeting is in violation of the Brown Act because you're not notifying all those areas that are affected by this plan.
- COG needs to notify if the January meeting is happening or not.
- Is there open space proposed on this map and what is open space (what does it mean/include)?
 - Open space is unbuilt land; Ag, watershed, floodplain, park & rec., etc.- We haven't written the plan yet so we don't know how open space would be preserved in the future. We haven't written policies yet.

* Activities included three (3) fire drills!