



Buildout Reduction Program Citizens' Committee (BRPCC)

REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, September 27, 2016 - 3:00 PM
2850 Burton Drive Cambria CA 93428

AGENDA

1. OPENING

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ESTABLISH QUORUM
- C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may now address the Committee on any item of interest within the jurisdiction of the Committee but not on its agenda today. In compliance with the Brown Act, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items not on the agenda. Each speaker has up to three minutes. Speaker slips (available at the entry) should be submitted to the District Clerk.

3. REGULAR BUSINESS

- A. Consideration to Approve the Minutes from the Regular Meeting held on September 13, 2016
- B. Discussion of Progress Toward Identifying Undeveloped Lots
- C. Discussion of Progress Toward Identifying All Outstanding Active and Inactive Service Commitments
- D. Discussion and Review of Lot Retirement Methods

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

5. ADJOURN



Buildout Reduction Program Citizens' Committee (BRPCC)

REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, September 13, 2016 - 10:00 AM
2850 Burton Drive Cambria CA 93428

MINUTES

1. OPENING

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Siegler called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

B. ESTABLISH QUORUM

Committee Members Present:

Ted Siegler, Crosby Swartz, Laura Swartz, Cindy Steidel, Greg Hunter, Mel McColloch, Mark Rochefort

Committee Members Absent:

Allison Groves, Sue Robinson, Bob Sfarzo

Staff Present:

Haley Dodson, Confidential Administrative Assistant

Ex-Officio Members present:

Daniel Bohlman, Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo (via phone)

Committee Member McColloch stated that Committee Member Robinson is resigning from the committee, due to other obligations. She won't be attending the meetings anymore.

Chairman Siegler stated that Committee Member Groves hasn't attended the meetings either. He will seek guidance from the CCSD EIR AD HOC Committee Members, and recommend they accept resignations of members who can't attend the meetings. He stated he would like the CCSD Board of Directors to nominate two other candidates.

C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Siegler stated he still hasn't heard back from UC Berkeley regarding legal representation. He will follow-up with an email to try and get input.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. REGULAR BUSINESS

- A. Consideration to Approve the Minutes from the Regular Meeting held on August 30, 2016

Committee Member Crosby Swartz motioned to approve the minutes.

Committee Member Hunter seconded the motion.

Motion was approved: 7-Ayes, 0-Nays, 3-Absent (Committee Members Allison Groves, Sue Robinson, Bob Sfarzo)

- B. Discussion and Review of Lot Retirement Methods

Public Comment:

Chairman Siegler read an email that was forwarded to him from Deryl Robinson.

The Committee reviewed the Revenue Brainstorming excel spreadsheet on the projector. They had an extensive discussion about the spreadsheet and made many revisions to the titles and definitions.

Chairman Siegler stated he'd like Daniel Bohlman to give the committee information regarding the TDC program. Mr. Bohlman stated they are exploring the possibility, with encouragement from CCSD, regarding expanding to Cambria, not just Special Project Area 1 and Special Project Area 2. It will go to the Board of Supervisors for approval in December. The TDC price went up from \$15 per TDC to \$25 per TDC, effective January 1, 2016.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairman Siegler would like the Committee to look at the Revenue Brainstorming spreadsheet (attached) and think about which topics each member would like to work on.

Chairman Siegler would like to add discussion of progress toward identifying undeveloped APN's and discussion of progress toward identifying all outstanding active and inactive service commitments to the next agenda. He would like to keep Regular Business Item B on the next agenda.

Consensus was reached to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, September 27th at 3:00 p.m.

Public Comment:

President Robinette stated she appreciates the committee's dedication and thanks the committee for their time, research, and dialogue.

5. ADJOURN

Committee Member Laura Swartz motioned to adjourn the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Committee Member Rochefort seconded the motion.

Motion was approved: 7-Ayes, 0-Nays, 3-Absent (Committee Members Allison Groves, Sue Robinson, Bob Sfarzo)

?	Increase/impose Fees on new development for mitigation purposes	Outside Private Funding	State Contribution	Public/Private Partnership	Increase Price of TDC's	Open Space District/Authority	Real Property Assessments	County/State Contribution	Sales Tax	Transient Occupancy Tax and related	New Development	Park/Open Space Fees	Fire Mitigation	General Mitigation Fee	Melo-Roos Fee	Remodelling Mitigation	Selling Unallocated Water Positions	Resell Lots with Restrictions
0. Definition	Fees specifically levied on new development and remodeling for acquisition and maintenance of open space within the Cambria Urban Boundary.	TDC Program including potential expansion. Direct contributions from citizens and/or foundations. Contributions from private organizations and individuals. With conservancies, conservation easements would be required.	Combine with Column I	Private foundation whose purpose is to use funds to accomplish a public benefit. Use of an incentive scheme establishing a private enterprise in exchange for the enterprise maintaining undeveloped property.	Combine with Column C	A special district to acquire and manage open space. Authority established by legislature, district by LAFCO. Would require approval of a parcel tax to implement. Recommended by North Coast Area Plan. May require separating acquisition from maintenance.	CCSD PROS authority or new agency formation.	Special legislation, public grants. Focus on Coastal Access and habitat preservation		Special allocation from county specifically to protect environment and/or new tax purposed to BRP purposes.	Combine with Column B	Combine with open space district. Keep in mind the difference between parks and pure open space. Both have pros and cons.	Constraints on development in special fire hazard zones. Combine with Column B?	Combine with Column B		Combine with mitigation.	Address to see if legal	Under what circumstances and how would this work with various deed restrictions?
1. Who would have to implement each process? Who would have to manage the process?	CCSD under PROS authority or another agency to be formed.	CCSD, County, Conservancies	CCSD, County and state voters	Citizens groups, Conservancies	CCSD and Conservancies	New agency	CCSD, County and local voter approval	CCSD, County and state voters	CCSD, County and local voter approval	CCSD/SLO County	CCSD	?	?	?	?	?	CCSD	CCSD
2. What's the potential size of economic impact?	Depends on the size of fee multiplied by the number of properties developed. Time phased by when development occurs?	\$25 per square foot transferred. Set by market. Probably won't go higher. Potentially lower for new construction vs remodel.	Unable to determine revenue or expenses to set up and manage. Would require special assessment district	Not known	Dependent on remodeling and new construction		Dependent on assessment rate set upon real property		Dependent on sales tax rate	Depends on the size of tax implemented	Impact only to Wait List Owners/Developers						Limited to the number of unallocated water positions and market value	Dependent on the lot price set by the CCSD. CCSD would benefit by reduction of lot maintenance expense
3. What are the legal ramifications?	California Mitigation Fee Act - proportional to benefit	May require formation of special district, management and reporting	State voter approval, if required, highly unlikely	May require formation of special district, management and reporting	None	May require formation of special district, management and reporting	Voter approval		Voter approval		None						Potential lawsuits from wait list lot owners, no growth factions and conservation groups	Use of proceeds would be restricted to Build Out Reduction Program
4. What are the political issues?	Is there an approval process or can this be mandated by CCSD/County?		Why should state voters approve funding local issue	None	Release of water meters for new construction - anti growth		Property owners/voters would not approve rate increase		Voters would not approve rate increase	Possible objection by tourist board, Chamber of Commerce, motel/B&B owners	None						See #3 above	None
5. What's the practicality/benefit of imposing this solution? - Pros and Cons	Impacts Water waitlist users leaves maintenance to the community		Would generate revenue without directly impacting community	Would generate revenue but would not impact current residents	Could generate a sizable amount of revenue not impacting residents					Would generate revenue but would not impact current residents	Would generate revenue but would not impact current residents							Would provide funds for BRP and reduce CCCSD maintenance expenses
6. Who are the constituents and what is the proportionality between who pays and who benefits? Combine with #5?	Only new construction would pay		Citizens of CA would pay to benefit Cambria	Funded by State of Conservancy Grps. Benefiting Cambria	Only new home builders or remodelers. No expense to other residents		Real property owners would pay benefiting Cambria		Residents, visitor/tourists would pay increased sales tax benefiting BRP/ Cambria	Tourists would pay 100% benefiting community	Only new construction would pay						Buyers of the water positions would pay benefiting the BRP	Homeowners would have larger lots for personal use excluding building. BRP benefits
7. Is this method directed & predictable?	Yes. Depends on rate of development. Would generate revenue only if building occurs	No	Would never pass	Could be directed at funding resources but it is not predictable	Could estimate revenue from remodeling based upon historical numbers. New home revenue dependent on the release and growth rate set		This is direct and revenue stream would be predictable		This is direct and revenue stream would be predictable	Depending on the size of the tax, entirely predictable	Would generate revenue only if water meters are released						Yes	No
8. What obstacles might be encountered (i.e., LAFCO resistance to new agency or district formation)?	Is a public vote or protest process necessary?		Management expense	None	New construction anti growth	Tension between CCSD responsibility to mitigate population growth vs another governmental body acting to do the work.	Failure to pass tax increase		Failure to pass tax increase	Not likely any. County would collect increased tax and remit Cambria's share	None						See #3 above	Could be resistance from environmentalists wanting to preserve natural setting

Lot Mergers and other voluntary retirements

Some kind of incentive structure