

Clarksburg Fire Protection District
52902 Clarksburg Avenue, P.O. Box 513
Clarksburg, CA 95612
Special Meeting
February 26, 2024, 4:30 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

Chairman Mark Pruner called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

Members present:

Joe Gomes, Mark Pruner, Steve Pylman, and Bob Webber
Richard Bagby, Commission Secretary

Members excused:

Nancy Kirchhoff

Fire personnel present:

Chief Craig Hamblin, Assistant Chief Richard Bagby, and Firefighter Joe Gomes

Public present:

There were no members of the general public present.

Approval of the Agenda:

It was moved by Commissioner Pylman and seconded by Commissioner Gomes to approve the agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote.

Review updated Engineer's Report for the Proposed New Special Assessment:

Commissioner Pylman shared an observation with the Board. The Commissioner reported talking with a local landowner who had the perception that his property was going to be re-assessed. Commissioner Pylman clarified to the landowner that the Proposed 218 assessment will not result in a change of his assessed value, only in the amount of the Proposition 218 Benefit Assessment. Notwithstanding his clarification to this particular landowner, the Commissioner remained concerned regarding this point of confusion for others.

Chairman Pruner presented the latest draft of the proposed assessment schedule from SCI Consulting and expressed the need for the Board to understand the various aspects of how the actual benefit assessments were calculated. Commissioner Webber reported that he had, at the request of Chairman Pruner, studied the draft and had come to the conclusion that there is no way the reader can understand how the various benefit assessments are calculated. Commissioner Webber underscored the need to understand the actual equations that calculate the assessments for the various parcels.

An extended discussion ensued that included, but was not limited to; side by side comparison of the proposed assessment with the existing assessment; the assessment of all parcels, including non-profit and government parcels; the influence of zoning on the actual assessment; the numerous other factors that contribute the calculations of the new assessment; the use of the single-family equivalent (SFE) as a basis for various other assessment categories; and the disproportionate increase for commercial (business) properties. There was extended discussion as the Board examined various parcel assessments in the proposed assessment table provided by SCI Consulting.

Following the aforementioned discussion, the discussion focused on eight specific areas of concern and questions relating to the proposed assessment. Those areas were:

1. We are committed to supporting our firefighters, our volunteers; these are the people we know the Community supports as well. The truth of the matter with the proposed new assessment is that all money raised stays in the District to have a better fire service for our residents. We are committed to staying with what we have, and making it better. It is important to clearly state this commitment, and these facts, in each communication from us related to the proposed assessment.
2. The cells in the parcel analysis and the top 100 landowner spreadsheets (Excel spreadsheets) received January 23 from Jeanette, contain stated values, not formulas. This means we cannot see the formulas, values and information used to calculate each parcel's proposed assessment. The spreadsheets sent January 23 are more like pdf documents. We need an active spreadsheet in order to properly evaluate the analysis. Please send both spreadsheets, update to the latest draft Engineer's Report, in active form, with all values and formulas shown in each cell where there is a calculation.
3. It appears that the first section of analysis calculates the SFE as a starting point for calculating proposed assessment rates for the other property uses. In particular it does not seem to follow to use the SFE as a starting point for calculating the proposed per acre assessment for Agriculture parcels. Clarksburg is an Agriculture district. Perhaps the analysis should begin with an Agriculture equivalent. It does not appear that the Engineer's Report clearly shows why the Agriculture per acre should be based on the SFE, rather than the other way around, or rather than separate an Agriculture equivalent calculation. What are your thoughts?
4. If we lower the total proposed assessment by a certain percentage, will the proposed assessments on all parcels then be reduced by the same percentage?
5. For all parcels, please prepare parcel calculations for all parcels, and for the top 100 landowners, if the total proposed assessment is \$85,000, and another set of the total proposed assessment is \$100,000.
6. Regarding the current assessment, we have decided to express the vote as a yes to set the new assessment and to terminate the old assessment, or not. Please amend the draft Engineer's Report accordingly.
7. Looking at Table 3, page 14 of the current proposed Engineer's Report, where did the 24/25 estimated budget numbers come from?

8. We need to “ground truth” the assessment, but need to address each of the above matters first.

With no further business before the Commission, it was moved by Commissioner Webber and seconded by Commissioner Pylman to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by a roll call vote and the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Bagby
Secretary to the Commission