Delta Citizens Municipal Advisory Council

P.O. Box 189, Walnut Grove, CA 95690, Phone 916-776-1161

Meeting Minutes

Date:

10/24/19

Call To Order:7:05 PM Adjourned:

8:10 PM

Location:

Jean Harvie Community Center, 14273 River Road, Walnut Grove, CA 95690

Prepared By: Amelia Wareham, Secretary

Call To Order I.

1. Roll Call

Present:

Gil Labrie, Chairman

Michael Steinbacher, Vice-Chair William Schauer

Amelia Wareham, Secretary

John Baranek

Bradford Pappalardo

Topper van Loben Sels Sandra Waterhouse

Excused:

Joseph Salman, Sally Shanks

Absent:

Stan Eddy

Quorum Present:

Yes (8).

2. Introductions:

County Representative(s)

Present:

Alma Munoz, Clerk of the Board Office.

Guest Speakers:

None.

Public Attendees:

None.

- 3. Role of Council Skipped. No one from the public was present.
- II. **Old Business** -- No old business addressed.
- III. **New Business** – No new business addressed.

20191024 DCMAC Minutes Final.docx Prepared by Amelia Wareham, Secretary 11/13/19 12:36 PM

Page 1 of 6

IV. Discussion Item: PER's proposed changes to Advisory Council Bylaws and Ordinance Changes.

Council moved to:

Request that County Planning and Environmental Review (PER) remove DCMAC from the proposed Resolution, which repeals the Council's existing bylaws, and request that PER work collaboratively with DCMAC to update DCMAC's existing bylaws to address any significant areas of procedural concern, while respecting the unique differences from the CPAC's and special needs of the Delta Communities that have been served by DCMAC members for over 40 years.

Moved by: Sandra Waterhouse, 2^{nd} by Bill Schauer. Vote: Yes – all, No – none. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion Summary:

- 1. Politics are pressuring changes in favor of developers at the cost of community involvement/input. Limiting local reviews makes process ineffective, ultimately moves control to County Planning and makes Councils unnecessary.
- 2. "One-size-fits-all" approach does not meet diverse needs of individual communities.
- 3. Delta has special requirements, additional governing agencies for compliance, Special Planning Areas. Delta does not deal with major development efforts. Deals with different land use requirements.
- 4. Advisory Councils' role in planning review processes is being neutered by proposed changes. Council Chair no longer has voice in agenda items. Delta's DCMAC process has been effective for over 40 years. It's not broken. Don't "fix it".
- 5. Term Limits destroys history, knowledge and leadership critical to Council's decision making.
- 6. Voting & Quorum– Removal of Continuance vote effectively takes Council and community out of review process. Eliminates collaboration. Quorum: allowing hearing of a matter by one person negates purpose of Councils.
- 7. Attendance—County is treating Council like children. We can't manage our own attendance?
- 8. Officers Removal of Secretary position eliminates detailed local record keeping. PER's Referral statement is far too high level.

20191024 DCMAC Minutes Final.docx Prepared by Amelia Wareham, Secretary Printed: 11/13/19 12:36 PM

9. PER's Process – was disrespectful and inconsiderate of Councils. There was insufficient time provided to review 230 pages of proposed changes. It has not been a collaborative effort.

Discussion Details:

 DCMAC's Position: Request that PER to remove DCMAC from proposed Resolution, and to have PER work collaboratively with DCMAC to modify bylaws to meet everyone's needs.

DCMAC's existing bylaws give the Council the authority to change their own bylaws. DCMAC requests opportunity to work with PERs to do that.

- Labrie: Politics are affecting Advisory Council purpose/function.
 - The planning staff and Commission are following directives from the Board. The Board is reacting to political pressure from developers who feel the local process is too one-sided and has been unfair.
 - BOS is being pressured by Building Industry Association (which represents developers) to expedite project reviews and fast-track approval for their development projects.
 - Development matters do not apply to the Delta and DCMAC. Delta is a no-growth area. Applying procedural changes for other CPACs to DCMAC does not serve the community's needs. It hurts the Delta.
 - The Advisory Councils are important forums for input from citizens directly
 affected by a project. Limiting the number of local reviews, as the proposed
 resolution states, makes the local review process ineffective and, in the end,
 unnecessary.
 - PER's proposed changes accommodate developers at the expense of community input from those people most directly affected by the projects.

20191024 DCMAC Minutes Final.docx Prepared by Amelia Wareham, Secretary Printed: 11/13/19 12:36 PM

- DCMAC/Delta is unique does not have same issues as other Advisory Councils.
 - Why is DCMAC unique/different why PER's proposed "one-size fits all" approach does not fit the Delta's needs:
 - DCMAC represents multiple communities. Other CPACs only represent one community.
 - DCMAC is a forum for communication and collaboration with diverse Delta citizens and requirements.
 - The Delta is a limited growth area. It is governed by multiple public agencies, including PER in the planning review process, and others in the overall permitting process.

Some of the agencies include: Delta Protection Commission, Delta Stewardship Council, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and US Army Corps of Engineers. Department of Water Resources has influence through the DSC and Flood Board.

Delta waterways are subject to Special Planning Area Ordinances with zoning standards.

- DCMAC has long history with PER in collaborative work to develop Special Planning Area zoning, Delta Community Plan, and County Water-Way zoning as governing tools while other CPACs deal with just the zoning code.
- Pappalardo Comments:

While the County is couching this as being sensitive to developers, it is more an opportunity to garner more power for the County. Does the County/PER really want community involvement/input on neighborhood development projects.? The proposed changes do not achieve that.

The proposed changes are sweeping, intending to make major changes in the review process without really addressing ways for an applicant to expedite the process. Its overall effect is to limit the ability of the community from having meaningful input in the review process. We are an "advisory council." Does BOS want community advisement or not? In the long history of DCMAC, there has not been a problem with the "council" not handling matters expeditiously or fairly."

Waterhouse Comment:

The Delta is the only PER area that has a proposal by the State for a Tunnel with potential negative impacts including economics, agriculture, real estate, the future of Sacramento County and entire State of California.

Agenda Management

Council Chair - will no longer be able to manage the agenda items.

Removes the Chair's ability to call a special meeting, add agenda items. Takes away opportunity for other communities to bring subject matter before DCMAC for discussion.

All agendas will be set by County Planning and/or BOS. – Effect: DCMAC has no control over agenda. Essentially neuters Council.

DCMAC's Position: County needs to re-consider this.

- Term Limits: Proposal -- Tenure on Council limited to 2 years.
 - Unlimited term limits have enabled the DCMAC to incorporate a unique historical perspective, knowledge, continuity and expertise into its review of the various planning land use and community issues over the years.
 - Two Year terms lose foundation for decisions.
 - Topper: There is a strong need for longevity of leadership. Unlimited term limits enable Council to do a better job. Enables consistency and continuity of knowledge. Council has been in place 42 years. Three members of Council have served entire 42 years. Other agencies have governance over the Delta like the Delta Protection Agency and Delta Stewardship Council.

Voting/Project Reviews-

Council will only see a project one time, at beginning of project reviews.

Proposal only gives Council option for Approval or Denial of a project. No option for Continuation. They have taken away Approval with Recommendations/Requirements.

This basically neuters the Council's effectiveness. Why bother having the Councils at all?

• Quorum: Proposal is that only one Council member be present to hear a matter.

Proposal is that one member's presence enables hearing a matter. Council cannot vote without quorum. If an item is only heard once in the new process, and if heard by one Council member and Council cannot ask for Continuance and Council cannot take a vote. . . By default, that meeting by one Council member means nothing, except that one of the five allocated meetings for a project's review has been completed by the County. "Quorum of One" negates purpose of Councils.

PERs would be better served to work with individual Chairs to insure quorums.

Attendance -- Absences - max of 4 absences per year.

County becomes attendance keeper. Council now must notify County if not attending. Effect: More work for Council. County treating Council like they are children.

Officers

Change to only two officers: Chair & Vice Chair. No Secretary. Lack of local Council Secretary means losing valuable information, details, content of meetings. Clerk of the Board – will be secretary and quasi-runs DCMAC meetings.

PER's Process

PER has been disrespectful and inconsiderate of Councils:

- Proposed changes have not been a collaborative process. PER made one attempt to get information from CPACs at beginning of process.
- Insufficient time was given for review by Advisory Councils before Planning Commission meeting.
- PER appears only interested in meeting their objective of presenting to the BOS.

V. Attachments/Attendees List - None.

Meeting Adjourned: Motion by: Sandra Waterhouse, 2nd by Bill Schauer, 8:10 pm.

20191024 DCMAC Minutes Final.docx Prepared by Amelia Wareham, Secretary Printed: 11/13/19 12:36 PM