

# **Buildout Reduction Program Citizens' Committee**

(BRPCC)

REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, June 14, 2016 - 10:00 AM  
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 May 17, 2016
- B. Discussion to ask CCSD Board of Directors to Appoint the Five Alternate Committee Members increasing the BRP Committee to Ten Members
- C. Discussion of Progress Regarding Historical Background of BRP
- D. Discussion of Progress Toward Identifying Undeveloped Lots
- E. Discussion on Progress of Identifying All Outstanding Active Service Commitments and Inactive Service Commitments

### **4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

### **5. ADJOURN**

**Buildout Reduction Program Citizens' Committee**  
(BRPCC)

REGULAR MEETING  
Tuesday, May 17, 2016 - 3:00 PM

**MINUTES**

**1. OPENING**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Committee Member Siegler called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**B. ESTABLISH QUORUM**

Committee Members Present:

Ted Siegler, Crosby Swartz, Allison Groves, Absent: Mel McColloch, Mark Rochefort

Alternates Committee members present:

Laura Swartz, Greg Hunter, Sue Robinson, Cindy Steidel, Bob Sfarzo

Staff Present:

Haley Dodson, Confidential Administrative Assistant

Ex-Officio members present: Glenn LaJoie (phone)

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public Comment: None

**3. REGULAR BUSINESS**

**A. Approve Minutes from Special Meeting on April 18, 2016 and Regular Meeting on May 3, 2016**

Committee Member Groves wanted to clarify from the minutes on April 18, 2016, under Section C, she didn't volunteer to take notes for the Committee and provide feedback to the District General Manager, as noted.

Committee Member Swartz moved to approve the minutes. Committee Member Groves seconded the motion.

Motion was approved: 5-Ayes, 0-Nos

**B. Historical Background of BRP**

Committee Member Siegler said in thinking about this background committee, it would be a good idea to spend time on the legal framework and how it relates to the loss of value for lot owners. We need to address that in the report.

Committee Member Siegler stated the BRP Committee is lucky to have an excellent slate of alternates and he would like to consider a ten person committee. It would require action from the board and consideration at the next month's meeting.

**C. Progress toward Identifying Undeveloped Lots**

Committee Member Groves handed out a Background Subcommittee Report (attached).

She stated in looking at the background of undeveloped lots, the following things need to be clarified:

1. What is a buildable lot?
2. What is not a buildable lot?
3. What are the buildable lots in Cambria?

4. What is the actual likelihood the lot will be built on?
5. If a lot is retired, we assume that it gets reassessed, what would be the cost to the county?

D. Progress of Identifying All Outstanding Active & Inactive Service Commitments

Committee Member Swartz stated we are losing fees and that seems like a lot of money. Committee Member Siegler doesn't know if any new meters have been connected. Committee Member Swartz said there has to be connections since 2008. Committee Member Groves said the information should be readily available and it's not.

Committee Member Hunter stated he met with the County of San Luis Obispo to extract information on lots we were interested in and also working on getting information regarding merged lots.

Committee Member Siegler stated the BRP is working with CCSD to accumulate documents and have it available on the webpage to the Committee and public. The BRP Committee received an email from CCSD with a list of water meters that are outstanding, a current waitlist, multiple family list, and commercial lists. Committee Member Siegler stated he hasn't been able to tie the data back to the Water Master Plan.

Committee Member Swartz said CCSD is only responsible for lots that are undeveloped. Cal Fire has a program for developed lots and we don't know how accessible their list is.

Committee Member Siegler stated we are putting together a plan and the data needs to be reliable. The plan needs to be updated every 2-3 years.

Committee Member Siegler said the North Coast area plan has mixed use of commercial property and residential units. There is no separate tracking of mixed use meters on a commercial account.

Questions to CCSD:

1. If there is mixed use development on commercial property, would CCSD provide a residential meter for a residential unit on that property? Or would CCSD require them to run it through a commercial meter?
2. Does CCSD have a policy of single properties with mixed use?

Committee Member Swartz asked if we are mandated to do affordable housing for low income, does affordable housing have to pay the water connection fees for the Buildout Reduction Plan? Water is water in terms of usage. Money is going to be an important issue. Committee Member Siegler questioned how the affordable housing waitlist will be capped; it's supposedly covered under the 4650.

Committee Member Steidel mentioned to look into vacation rentals, considering its 10%.

**4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A. Schedule next meeting

Consensus was reached to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, June 14, at 10:00 a.m.

**5. ADJOURN**

Committee Member Robinson motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:10 p.m. Committee Member Swartz seconded the motion.

Motion was approved: 5-Ayes, 0-Nos

*CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT  
BUILDOUT REDUCTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE*

**BACKGROUND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

We identified four major areas of concern with regard to the background and history of the Buildout Reduction Program in Cambria.

- I. Baseline Assumptions
- II. Probability Models for Likely Buildable Lots
- III. Acronyms and Terms
- IV. Questions for Staff/Counsel

**I. Baseline Assumptions**

Understanding the baseline assumptions made by the previous BRP committee and how those assumptions have changed and evolved will be critical in moving forward with this committee's recommendations for the program.

First, we are in the process of identifying the assumptions underlying the original report. One assumption made was that the program should be based on the County's projected 1% growth rate. While we have yet to fully analyze the data and understand that the data subcommittee is still working on gathering data, it appears that the area has not grown at quite this rate. The projected build-out has been less than what was predicted.

Second, we found two areas in which circumstances have significantly changed since the original Water Master Plan was developed. First, building in Cambria is not happening at the originally projected rate, and as a result growth assumptions may need to be revised. Second, as fire danger has increased, the cost of maintenance of a vacant lot has also increased. This impacts the potential cost of the program.

Third, we expect that as a result of these changes this Committee will need to investigate and develop new assumptions for the program going forward. We also anticipate that the underlying intent of the program may change slightly when new assumptions are in place.

**II. Probability Models for Likely Buildable Lots**

While the prior report looked at vacant lots as a whole, in projecting future growth we think it is important to consider the likelihood that a particular lot will actually be developed with a structure that impacts water use. We recommend

developing a model that considers the likelihood of potential development. Applying a Business Project Format to evaluate relative impact and risk could bring focus and help determine the significance of a given condition.

1. Size the population  
Quantify the subjective lot population being reviewed (Potential Development)
2. Assess level of probability  
Assign probability base on established parameters and variables (e.g., 80/20; 50/50; 20/80)
3. Define impact to the community  
Determine lot quantities that fall into high probability. If significant, determine additional community impact.

### **III. Acronyms and Terms**

We will be working on developing a glossary of terms to use as we move forward in developing the program.

### **IV. Questions**

We have the following questions about the program:

- (1) Who pays the taxes on a "retired" lot? If a lot is donated, we assume that the new owner pays the taxes. But we are not certain if this applies to a lot that is merely "retired" and no longer buildable.
- (2) Does a lot retirement require a reassessment by the County for property tax purposes? A lot retirement which renders a lot unusable would significantly impact the value of that lot. We assume the cost for reassessment would be paid by the County.
- (3) Is the lot owner responsible for fire mitigation (weed abatement) once a lot is retired?
- (4) What exactly is buildable (see Probability Model above)?
- (5) What should be the 90-day product of this Committee? Due to the complexity of this issue, the difficulty in obtaining data, and the constraints of the Brown Act, we foresee difficulty in achieving a workable plan in 60-90 days. If there is critical work-product that the Board of Directors must have within the 90-day time-frame, we would like to know so we can focus our efforts on that.