

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Jeff Roberts <JRoberts@assemigroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 4:34 PM
To: Clerk/BOS
Subject: Board of Supervisors Hearing (12-20-2024 @ 3:00 pm)

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

To the Clerk and members of the Board of Supervisors,

On Tuesday, 12-17-2024, I was in the audience at the Board meeting to watch and participate in the discussion on Item 7B (Fresno County / City Tax Sharing Agreement)

I was there to provide testimony in support of the item and to encourage the Board members to approve the agreement but did not get the opportunity due to the rescheduling of the item.

I will not be able to attend the rescheduled hearing on 12-20-2024 @ 3:00 pm but wish to offer my support for the approval of the item. Our Company has two pending annexation applications on file with the City that have been delayed due to this issue. We are optimistic that the approval of the item will allow both of these projects to move forward.

Thank you for your consideration.



Jeffrey T. Roberts | Entitlement Director

T: (559) 440-8308 | **M:** (559)288-0688 | **F:** (559) 436-1659 | **X:**308

E: jroberts@assemigroup.com

W: www.assemigroup.com

5260 N. Palm Ave., Ste. 421, Fresno, CA 93704

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any accompanying document(s) may be privileged and confidential, and are intended for the sole use of the addressee(s). If you have received this transmission in error, you are advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance upon it is strictly prohibited. Moreover, any such inadvertent disclosure shall not compromise or waive the attorney-client privilege as to this communication or otherwise. If you have received this communication in error, please delete it and contact us by replying to the sender or by telephone at 559-440-8300. Thank you.

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Rosana Cummings <rosana73@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 9:44 PM
To: District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: SEDA opposition

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

I oppose any yes vote that would advance the SEDA annexation. All studies show this to be a bad idea.

Rick Cummings

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

Subject: FW: December 17, 2024 BOS Meeting Agenda Item 7.2 - Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno

From: Elizabeth Sandberg <sshannah54@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 9:59 AM

To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: December 17, 2024 BOS Meeting Agenda Item 7.2 - Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Correction for :

"Annexation of substantially developed parcels within the City of Fresno's sphere of influence now have a proposed ratio of County: 70%, City: 30%. Under the expired MOU the ratio was County: 62%, City: 35%. That applies to county islands within the City of Fresno. That reduction in revenue to the City is a disincentive to annex county islands into the city. In the City of Fresno Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update, dated July 13, 2016 prepared for the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission it states on page 13, "Fresno LAFCo adopted a policy encouraging annexation of unincorporated island within city limits and requiring cities in Fresno County to develop plans to annex these areas." This change in tax sharing will add to the reluctance of the city to annex county islands."

City: 35% should read "City: 38%"

Elizabeth Sandberg

On Dec 16, 2024, at 11:38 PM, Elizabeth Sandberg <sshannah54@gmail.com> wrote:

December 16, 2024

To: Fresno County Board of Supervisors

From: Elizabeth Sandberg, Fresno County Resident

Subject: Board Agenda Item 7.2 Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno

As a Fresno County taxpayer I am concerned this tax sharing agreement will leave Fresno County taxpayers covering even more of the costs for services provided by Fresno County to the City of Fresno. Attached is the Fiscal Impact Report for County of Fresno by DTA dated November 17, 2020 showing the net county costs (NCCs) for provision of services by the County of Fresno to cities within the county. The City of Fresno's services were characterized by the highest total NCCs of \$127,016,314. It has been 4 years since that study. I am sure those NCCs are even higher now. I have included the DTA report as an attachment.

The proposed ratio for Southeast Development Area (SEDA) is County: 49%, City: 51%. For areas not in SEDA but still within Fresno City's Sphere of Influence the proposed ratio is County: 60%, City: 40%. The previous ratio for both scenarios was County: 62%, City 38%. At the Special Council Meeting of the City of Fresno on December 13, 2024 Georgeanne White, Fresno City Manager, reported that the increase to the city from 38% to 51% was estimated to be an extra couple million dollars per year for each \$100 million dollars of property value. The estimated increase to the city for the 38% going to 40% was about \$11,000 per year for each \$100 million dollars of property value. An extra couple million dollars is far more significant than \$11,000 and County of Fresno residents should not be subsidizing the City of Fresno for the Southeast Development Area.

This article published by GV Wire on September 19, 2023 is also worth reading, reporting the cost of services provided by Fresno County to the City of Fresno are a net cost to the County of Fresno.
[:tenants-until-they-get-it](#)

Annexation of substantially developed parcels within the City of Fresno's sphere of influence now have a proposed ratio of County: 70%, City: 30%. Under the expired MOU the ratio was County: 62%, City: 35%. That applies to county islands within the City of Fresno. That reduction in revenue to the City is a disincentive to annex county islands into the city. In the City of Fresno Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update, dated July 13, 2016 prepared for the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission it states on page 13, "Fresno LAFCo adopted a policy encouraging annexation of unincorporated island within city limits and requiring cities in Fresno County to develop plans to annex these areas." This change in tax sharing will add to the reluctance of the city to annex county islands.

The City of Fresno has additional environmental analysis to complete for the SEDA EIR, an estimate of the infrastructure cost has not been given to the public and a year has passed and the City of Fresno is still working on their responses to comments on the EIR that was released last year. SEGA now SEDA has been in the works for eighteen years. Until the EIR is complete, approved and looks like SEDA is actually moving forward it seems premature to include "Annexations that occur within the City's Southeast Development Area" in the proposed tax sharing MOU between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno.

I respectfully request consideration of Agenda Item 7.2 - Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno, be delayed until the fiscal impact to Fresno County taxpayers can be determined and the public has time to read and make comments to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors.

<County of Fresno Fiscal Impact Report 11-17-20.pdf>

Thank you,

Elizabeth Sandberg

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Jeff Wabbit <dwrarming@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:27 AM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: Tax Sharing Memorandum of Understanding Special Meeting December 20

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

December 19, 2024

To: Fresno County Board of Supervisors

From: Southeast Property Owners

Subject: Tax Sharing Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Fresno and Fresno County

Thank you for delaying the consideration of the tax sharing agreement between city of Fresno and Fresno County, so we, the people you represent, could have time to understand what is in the proposed MOU. There are a number of reasons the proposed tax sharing agreement should not be adopted as is.

1. This agreement **DRASTICALLY** changes the tax sharing ratio for SEDA from 62:38 (County:City) to 49:51. The other unincorporated areas within Fresno City's sphere of influence is set at 60:40. This is not right as it gives Fresno City incentive to develop SEDA over other areas in the city's sphere of influence. SEDA is being **UNFAIRLY** targeted and should have the same tax sharing ratio of 60:40 as the other areas so development is equally shared by all communities. This agreement is the ideal desire for developers of single family dwellings.
2. This tax sharing agreement is a direct attack against farm land and food production while promoting urban sprawl and causing greater deterioration of Fresno's inner city. The tax sharing ratio for SEDA promotes single family dwellings and not affordable housing to meet state mandated needs. Do not adopt an agreement that promotes: urban sprawl; converts farmland to unneeded single-family dwellings; and continues to devitalize the City of Fresno.
3. This Agreement greatly effects the SEDA development area, fostering annexation and development in the sphere of influence which will cause a significant effect on the environment by changing land use, changing water use, increasing traffic while increasing noise and air pollution. An Environmental Impact Report should be done to evaluate the effect of this Memorandum of Understanding on the environment before adoption.
4. In the submittal letter for consideration of this tax sharing agreement under Planning and Cooperative items it states:

Within 24 months of execution of the MOU, the City and County shall work collaboratively to develop a list of shared priority roads (Arterials, Super Arterials, and/or Collectors), for City to consider acquiring and maintaining. Acquisition by the City shall be subject to availability of future road tax revenues, include renewal of Measure C.

This indicates the city and county do not have enough resources to develop road improvements for the contemplated development and places that burden on taxpayers. The tax ratios in this agreement are clearly fostering development in SEDA to the detriment of Fresno taxpayers. This needs to be corrected.

We oppose the adoption of this Memorandum of Understanding for tax sharing as written and highly recommend not adopting it. It needs to be rewritten and changed to an equitable sharing ratio for all unincorporated areas within Fresno City's sphere of influence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

David W. Ramming
Vice President, Southeast Property Owners

ITEM #1

12/20/2024

From: Deborah Bigham <debbigham49@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 11:27 AM

To: District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: Tax sharing Agreement

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

As a Southeast property owner, I am in opposition to this tax sharing agreement. The ratio's are unfair and changed to allow for cheap, ugly SE development sprawl.

I say NO!!!!' Along with many others. Whom you will see at the Board meeting Friday. Please consider we the people who put you in your position. Thank you.

Deborah Bigham

ITEM#1
12/20/2024

Attachments: IMG_1481.jpeg; IMG_1483.jpeg

From: Brett Thompson <thompsonmobileweld@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:49 AM

To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: SEDA

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Mr. Magsig and fellow County Supervisors,

My name is Brett Thompson, my family resides in the area affected by the proposed SEDA plan.

I'd like to bring to your attention some detrimental environmental impacts the City's SEDA plan will cast on our Valley. Attached, please see clips from Fresnoland, City Officials state development will cause 500,000 Tons of carbon emissions annually, at an estimated \$25.5 million annually in fines paid by resident's tax dollars.

The SEDA project should not be exempt from CEQA guidelines due to terminologies, wether they call it a plan, project, development, etc. The City can call this destruction of rural property a rainbow but we all see it as a pig.

Another major concern, the County Board of Supervisors is voting to approve a MOU agreeing to fund critical infrastructure without a budget or estimated cost of these items. How can you agree to pay for something without knowing the costs analysis?

Please do not pass this MOU and do not let the City of Fresno turn beautiful farmland and rural County property into more mismanaged City of Fresno - overrun with blight, degraded properties, Swiss cheese's development, pollution, crime, homelessness, and City control. I urge each of you to simply take a look at how the City has failed in areas already in their control.

City officials must now go back to the drawing board to address these deficiencies if they hope to keep the massive SEDA project alive. But with a judge and a team of four environmental lawyers – rather than the Fresno City Council – scrutinizing the legality of future plans, the revised climate change plans will face a very different set of tests than last time.

Standard accounting measures could drive up the costs of pollution for developers. For example, using the Biden administration's estimate, the costs of SEDA's carbon emissions could come with a hefty \$25.5 million annual price tag. The project is also estimated, according to city documents, to triple air pollution levels in southeast Fresno.

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: ph057@cvip.net <ph057@cvip.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:44 AM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: SEDA

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

I cannot believe that the Board of Supervisors is trying to circumvent the wishes of the people who live in the Southeast area by having a special meeting tomorrow (December 20). Shame on you. NO TO SEDA!!

Paulette Hiraoka
Resident in Southeast Fresno

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Juliet Doty <helenthegho@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:34 AM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: SEDA Vote tomorrow

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Mr Magsig

I encourage you NOT to vote for the tax-sharing agreement for the further development of the SEDA area. I don't need to go into the shady EIR done on that project and how many residents will be affected in a negative way. You know all this. There are zero plans to address water, traffic and other services. Many people who live in the country, including my family, want to keep it that way. Country! We are opposed to this. Please vote no and speak for your constituents.

I would be at the meeting tomorrow but I have to work and since this major step was kinda slipped into the agenda and done during the holidays, I am unable to take time off from work. Feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Thank you!

Until next time,
Juliet

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: D SIMPSON <maildsimp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 8:44 AM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: Say NO to SEDA

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Nathan,

We depend on your continued character, integrity and support for the greater good of those who depend on you and your staff.

We need transparency on this issue before an approved County of Fresno vote goes through. The Live City of Fresno meeting clearly indicates they were blindsided, uninformed, didn't take time to do due diligence but haphazardly chose to vote it through. That is poor City of Fresno government support and sets in motion lawsuits, unease, mistrust, etc.

Right now, there is signs of mistrust as disclosed in the email, and that doesn't help anyone.

In the past, The county board of supervisors have always shown that we can trust and depend on our board members for our future. Please tell me and others that we don't have any concerns or nothing to worry about, that true transparency will occur, and this item will be tabled until it can be extensively considered by both the City and County. Let's NOT make a circus out of our board meetings similar to City of Fresno meetings. We are better than that.

Do what is right, as you have in the past, because we depend on you for the future of all your constituents.

Thank you, deby

I believe in transparency, so I'm including an: Excerpt of an email sent you me.

We all have been blindsided by these 11th hour tactics by our representatives.

We have just become aware within the last few hours of a special meeting by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors, regarding the tax-sharing agreement for the further development of the SEDA area. They may vote to approve the agreement at this meeting. This is a major step that will promote the development and annexation of the SEDA area into the city of Fresno.

It is imperative that you attend the meeting this coming Friday, December 20, at 3:00 p.m.

Address:
Hall of Records Room 301
2281 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721

If you are able to attend, please wear your "say no to SEDA"

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Rosana Cummings <rosana73@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 9:49 PM

To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: SEDA opposition

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

I am opposed to any yes vote that would move the SEDA annexation forward. All studies show this is a bad plan. A land grab by developers.

Rick Cummings

ITEM # 1
12/20/2024

From: Elizabeth Sandberg <sshannah54@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 3:21 PM

To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>; Linda Sharpsteen <sharpsteen51@gmail.com>

Cc: Elizabeth Sandberg <sshannah54@gmail.com>

Subject: Tax Sharing Memorandum of Understanding Special Meeting December 20

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

December 19, 2024

To: Fresno County Board of Supervisors

From: Elizabeth Sandberg, Fresno County Resident

Subject: Tax Sharing Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Fresno and Fresno County

Thank you for delaying your consideration of the tax sharing agreement between the City of Fresno and Fresno County allowing the citizens you represent to express our concerns to you.

I am not against finalizing a tax sharing agreement between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno. My concerns are the differences between SEDA and non-SEDA tax sharing ratios, the net cost to the County of Fresno because of those differences, and the incentive for the City of Fresno to develop SEDA over other areas in the city's sphere of influence. I oppose the adoption of this Memorandum of Understanding for tax sharing as it is currently written.

The following statements are from articles written for GV Wire:

"When you look at the numbers, the city of Fresno right now receives a disproportionate amount of services from the county," Magsig said. "So, for the city to come back and say they want a 50/50 split, for me to be able to support something like that, they would need to reduce the services that they currently are receiving to justify that. And they simply cannot."

Fresno city property owners generate 64% of the county's property and sales tax income, according to a 2020 study from the county. But its tax contribution only makes up 42.3% of its demand.

Magsig said a 50/50 split give the city of Fresno a subsidy that the other 14 cities in the county don't receive.

"For me, the current tax sharing agreement formula that the city has been using in the past is 100% adequate, just based up on the amount of usage that the city of Fresno uses of county services," Magsig said.

<https://gvwire.com/2023/09/19/fresno-city-wants-more-money-from-county-will-tax-some-new-home-buyers-tenants-until-they-get-it/>

Another article reports:

The previous 62/38 split (62% to the county, 38% to the city) expired in October 2020. Fresno leaders have said they want a 50/50 split, as was historically done. Magsig said Fresno's outsized demand for county services, such as social services, behavioral health, and more, prevents a 50/50 split.

https://gvwire.com/2024/01/29/is-fresno-done-growing-mayor-dyer-calls-for-halt-to-city-support-of-southeast-expansion/#google_vignette

Paul Dictos, CPA in an article from The Sun on October 5, 2023 titled "Fresno Co. can fix its housing crisis. Here's how", stated the following:

As County Assessor my job is to complete and maintain the assessment roll that shows the values and status of all property in Fresno County.

The roll, or tax roll, is the basis upon which the Tax Collector prepares and sends out property tax bills to property owners of record. Property taxes are the glue that allow the Board of Supervisors to maintain vital services in their area, as they provide funding for the first responders, K-12 schools, cities, and special districts.

Having served in this position for the past twelve years, I am able to make certain observations and suggestions that, if implemented, will support urban development, foster job opportunities, and strengthen the financial foundation of the County.

Fresno County includes the City of Fresno, California's fifth largest city. For several decades, Fresno County has had a policy of referring industrial, commercial, and residential projects proposed for development in the County to the City of Fresno, which, upon annexation of land to the City, would provide urban services such as sewer, water, and public safety (police, fire, and emergency medical).

However, in the last few years, the City of Fresno has refused to accept development proposals and permit the annexation of land, in the false belief that the allocation of property taxes between Fresno County and the City of Fresno unfairly favors the County.

Nothing could be further from the truth when all taxes - property, sales, and special-us taxes are taken into consideration.

<https://sjvsun.com/business/real-estate/fresno-co-can-fix-its-housing-crisis-heres-how/>

The Fiscal Impact Report for County of Fresno by DTA dated November 17, 2020 showed the net county costs (NCCs) for provision of services by the County of Fresno to cities within the county. The City of Fresno's services were characterized by the highest total NCCs of \$127,016,314. It has been 4 years since that study. I am sure those NCCs are even higher now. That document was sent as an attachment in the e-mail I sent to all the Board of Supervisors on December 16, 2024.

The proposed ratio for Southeast Development Area (SEDA) is County: 49%, City: 51%. For areas not in SEDA but still within Fresno City's Sphere of Influence the proposed ratio is County: 60%, City: 40%. The previous ratio for both scenarios was County: 62%, City 38%. At the Special Council Meeting of the City of Fresno on December 13, 2024 Georgeanne White, Fresno City Manager, reported that the increase to the city from 38% to 51% was estimated to be an extra couple million dollars per year for each \$100 million dollars of property value. The estimated increase to the city for the 38% going to 40% was about \$11,000 per year for each \$100 million dollars of property value. An extra couple million dollars is far more significant than \$11,000 and County of Fresno residents should not be subsidizing the City of Fresno for the Southeast Development Area.

As a Fresno County taxpayer I am concerned this tax sharing agreement will leave Fresno County taxpayers covering even more of the costs for services provided by Fresno County fo the City of Fresno.

Until a fiscal impact report can be done to see the net effect on Fresno County from loss of tax dollars because of the differing tax ratio of SEDA, SEDA should have the same ratio as other areas in the City's sphere of influence, County: 60%, City; 40%.

The proposed tax sharing ratio for SEDA is incentive for the City of Fresno to develop SEDA over other areas in Fresno City's sphere of influence promoting urban sprawl, devitalizing the City of Fresno, removing prime farmland from production and disrupting the rural life style that living in Fresno County provides. The City of Fresno's Annexed Rural Residential Transitional (ANX) Overlay **severely** restricts the use of Rural Residential property. For me, I am now allowed to have 16 horses on my 3.5 acre parcel. Under the City's ANX the allowance is 4 horses. There are too many other restrictions to list but there are many.

During the Fresno City Council discussion on their accepting the tax sharing agreement it was often stated that this did not promote or encourage development in SEDA. With the difference in tax sharing ratio's I believe it does as there is financial incentive to develop SEDA.

The following was in an article from FresnoLand:

The 2003 agreement slashed the city's cut of property tax revenues for new subdivisions by 19%.

The cut was meant to wean the city off its long-standing impulse to plant homes at the city's fringe, White said. But as the city has revived its once-defunct, decades-old plan for SEDA, the tax sharing agreement has become a major thorn in the city's general fund projections.

Revived "at the request of the industry," White said the drive to build SEDA has caused the city some growing pains. Development in the area would be "rocking and rolling" without the 19% cut, she said.

Even with the old tax-sharing agreement, however, the financial consequence of sprawl ripple across Fresno. A recent report showed that the city's investment in sprawl has been the key cause of the city's urban blight.

<https://fresnoland.org/2023/09/29/fresno-granville/>

As I stated at the beginning I am not against finalizing a tax sharing agreement between the County of Fresno and the City of Fresno. But I am against an agreement that promotes the development of SEDA over other areas and is detrimental to Fresno county taxpayers.

I oppose the adoption of this Memorandum of Understanding for tax sharing as written and strongly recommend not adopting it. It needs to be revised and changed to have the same tax sharing ratio for all unincorporated areas within Fresno City's sphere of influence

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Elizabeth Sandberg
Fresno County Resident

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Bruce Owen <bruce.owen99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 1:11 PM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: Tax sharing agreement

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Dear sir,

Very disappointing to see the way the city and county have come to a tax sharing agreement vote the week before Christmas. I find it difficult to believe this was all by happenstance.

Sadly all I can do is send an email to register my disgust, that once again the developers run the show.

Bruce Owen

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

ITEM#1
12/20/2024



Building Industry Association
of Fresno/Madera Counties, Inc.

December 19, 2024

Supervisor Nathan Magsig, Chairman
Fresno County Board of Supervisors
Fresno County Hall of Records
2281 Tulare Street, Room 301
Fresno, CA 93721

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2024

CLERK. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

VIA EMAIL

Dear Chairman Magsig and Supervisors,

On behalf of the Building Industry Association of Fresno/ Madera Counties (BIAFM), I am writing to express our strong support for the proposed tax sharing agreement currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors. We believe that this initiative has the potential to significantly benefit our region, foster economic growth, and support residential, commercial and industrial development in the County and City of Fresno. Furthermore, thank you to both the County Board of Supervisors and the Fresno City Council for moving this critical issue forward.

The tax sharing agreement between the City and County of Fresno represents a collaborative effort to equitably distribute revenues generated by new development projects. By ensuring that both the city and the surrounding areas benefit from growth, this agreement promotes a balanced approach to regional development. It is crucial for the long-term success of our community that we create an environment where local businesses and workers can thrive while also addressing the needs and concerns of our residents.

As building industry representatives, we understand the challenges that come with growth, such as the need for improved infrastructure, public services, and the need to increase the local housing supply. The proposed tax sharing agreement will provide the necessary resources to address these challenges effectively. By pooling resources, we can invest in vital infrastructure projects, enhance public services, and facilitate the development of market-rate housing options that meet the needs of our growing population.

Moreover, this agreement will stimulate job creation in the building industry and economic activity within Fresno County. The building industry plays a vital role in this process, and we are eager to collaborate with the city and county to ensure that growth is both sustainable and beneficial to the community and region at large.

We urge the Fresno County Board of Supervisors to support the proposed tax sharing agreement. By doing so, you will be investing in the future and quality of life for all our residents. We appreciate your consideration of this important matter and look forward to working together to create a prosperous and thriving economy.

Thank you for your attention and dedication to the betterment of Fresno County.

Sincerely,



Darren C. Rose

President/ CEO

Building Industry Association of Fresno/ Madera Counties

CC:

Supervisor Steve Brandau

Supervisor Buddy Mendes

Supervisor Brian Pacheco

Supervisor Sal Quintero

Paul Nerland, CAO

Steve White, Director of Planning & Development

BIAFM Board of Directors

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

DATE: December 19, 2024
TO: NATHAN MAGSIG, DISTRICT 5 Supervisor
District5@fresnocountyca.gov
FROM: Alan and Elizabeth Cederquist
RE: Current Scheduled Board Meeting for MOU Approval

RECEIVED
DEC 20 2024

CLERK. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

We have been residents of the proposed SEDA (aka: SEGA) area since 1996.

It has been quite a painful experience to sit and watch the City of Fresno and County try and try again to capture this approximately 9,000 acres in order to annex to the City for a massive development plan. Or, in better terms: *A new tax revenue source* that would eventually suffer the consequences of blight, poor air quality, demands on water, congested streets, noise and waste buildup, fire and police demands, and provide very little in comparison to what was lost.

A plan that would destroy huge portions of farmland, as well as neighborhoods of multiple acreage residential properties (ranchettes) and single family homes. Areas that would become filled with all the things we long term residents of your *SEDA* plan want to avoid.

We cannot understand why you would allow this sprawl into the county happen when the City of Fresno has so many open areas of opportunity to build homes for many in need and would have so many of the urban services already available and nearby. Why should the city have so many blighted areas within its boundaries that could be developed quickly and not require all the machinations of regulations, votes, and negative impact of county lands? These areas within the city limits *have already had some form of construction on them* before they were left bare. You are attempting to spread out to newer areas, yet let the inner city fall to disrepair and vacant plots of abandon acreages. Why do you continue to ignore this alternative?

Many of the queries into areas of available land for development, available water, and existing population seem to show a better selection of annexation within the boundaries of the City, or in the other proposed areas to the south and west of the city.

We certainly resent having to be crowded out of our own homes, and/or subjected to huge investments to bring our properties up to service codes of water, sewer, and construction to match the City requirements.

Oh, and by the way, having these quickly scheduled meetings during a holiday season, when many cannot attend or they miss the announcement, is a lousy thing to do. Your urban sprawl affects so many people and yet it seems this is how the City and County officials avoid input of the people impacted with these poorly designed and invasive plans.

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Marilyn Mathew <mym6@juno.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 11:28 PM
To: District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: MOU

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

12/19/2024

To: Board of Supervisors

This MOU's primary purpose is to allow the adoption of the city's SEDA plan. Just look at the percentages that are proposed and one can see that the SEDA is being targeted for development far more than other areas. It is being proposed with much urgency and at a time of the year that limits any possible objections. If the last MOU expired 8/29/2020, why all the urgency now? This is the same strategy that is utilized in a scam.

The adoption of any MOU that is this skewed would be a major mistake. Look at how the city's SEDA plan has evolved to date. No effort has been expended to modify or improve it, but rather all energy is directed on the strategy to adopt it. This plan is so flawed that the man who was responsible for its conception is now one of its most vocal critics. Any action that would help to promote its adoption would be dubious at best and subject the county to law suits that the city has already experienced due to its inadequacies.

We sincerely request that you represent the county residents that elected you and reject this tax extortion attempt by the city and its special interest groups.

Sincerely,

Michael and Marilyn Mathew

SEDA Residents

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Annette Paxton <annettepaxton82@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 20, 2024 6:00 AM

To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: Vote No: SEDA Tax Sharing Agreement

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Please do not approve the future development and annexation of the SEDA area into the City of Fresno.

As a 38-year property owner in the proposed annexation area, I request that you -- as a Fresno County Supervisor -- help SEDA area citizens maintain our quality of life outside of the City of Fresno limits.

The SEDA plan is not a responsible land management plan. Its impacts that affect today are relatively small compared to the long term effects of Fresno's tomorrow. SEDA's plan hurts air quality, agricultural production and water access. The greenhouse gas emissions add to global warming. The EIR clearly states there are no mitigation options for any of these concerns.

Please stop this unrelenting land grab and protect California's unique central valley.

Vote "NO"

Thank you,

-- **Annette Paxton**

7412 E Pine Avenue, Fresno 93737

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: amoon1@aol.com <amoon1@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 7:04 PM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: SEDA Vote NO

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

We understand a tax sharing vote between Fresno City and County , the next step forward for SEDA is taking place Friday.

As residents of Fresno County we are vehemently opposed to any measure that moves SEDA forward.

We guard our right to live our country life the way we want. Please vote NO on any SEDA measure.

We the People Decide!
Rusty and Alison Moon
2346 N Highland Ave
Fresno 93737

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: helen ramming <hramming@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 8:58 PM
To: District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: Memorandum of Understanding, Tax Sharing Agreement

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

December 20, 2024

To: The Fresno County Board of Supervisors

This letter is in protest to the proposed 51/49% Tax Sharing ratio for SEDA in the Memorandum of Understanding between the county and the city. If passed, the door is open to encourage Urban Sprawl.

We have appreciated working with the Board of Supervisors in the past, but we currently have some major concerns. Because you are considering this 51/49% division, and were initially going to vote on this without any notice to the residents, and since you chose to do this one week before Christmas, we feel you don't really understand our position even though we were under the impression you did.

We farm our land and development would personally force us out due to water concerns, inability to spray, and the urban atmosphere. Our two major concerns are loss of prime agriculture land and water restrictions although other concerns include crime, pollution, and in general, problems associated with urban areas. Why do you even consider developing what is known as the best land in the country with its sandy soil?

Your vote will encourage urban sprawl in the SE area and would undermine the value of agriculture that has been Fresno's history. The wholesome rural way of life should be promoted. The fact that you are planning to push this agreement forward only five days before Christmas, makes us question your values as to what you are trying to accomplish.

The City's desire to implement this plan has in so many ways been unethical,, including the lack of notification to residents in the beginning, the evasive or inconsistent answers at Town Hall meetings, the EIR with its many issues left unaddressed, and the list goes on. It can only be assumed that the driving force behind the City's underhanded actions is money.

We are asking that the Board of Supervisors maintain a high value system. "We the People" made a strong statement in the last election - opposing greed and unethical practices. We want Fresno to apply high standards on a local level. It is one thing to lose our property because it is the will of the people, but it is another thing to lose our property because of political gain.

My request is that you do not adopt this Memorandum of Understanding. Instead, **please use the Tax Sharing Agreement as leverage to hold the City accountable in all aspects**, including the injustices that they are trying to slide through - such as not having concrete budget figures for their plans.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Helen Ramming
hramming@yahoo.com
559-252-5658

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Juliet Doty <helenthegho@me.com>
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2024 8:23 AM
To: District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>
Subject: SEDA Vote today

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

>> Good morning.

>> I live in the area that SEDA would impact if this is voted in (Magsigs district). I encourage you NOT to vote for the tax-sharing agreement for the further development of the SEDA area. I don't need to go into the shady EIR done on that project and how many residents will be affected in a negative way. You know all this. There are zero plans to address water, traffic and other services. Many people who live in the country, including my family, want to keep it that way. Country! We are opposed to this. Please vote no and speak for your constituents.

>> I would be at the meeting tomorrow but I have to work and since this major step was kinda slipped into the agenda and done during the holidays, I am unable to take time off from work. Feel free to call me if you have any questions. 960.5423

>> Thank you!

Until next time,
Juliet

ITEM #1
12/20/2024

From: Steve Sacks <johnsonsacks1@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 20, 2024 10:54 AM

To: District 1 <district1@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 2 <district2@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 3 <district3@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 4 <district4@fresnocountyca.gov>; District 5 <district5@fresnocountyca.gov>

Subject: Tax Sharing Agreement and SEDA

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Report Suspicious

Hi,

As a Fresno County resident, briefly I wanted to share that I have no issue with the tax sharing agreement with the city. However, if you are planning to support the SEDA plan, I have serious concerns about the environmental impacts, the lack of water, the lack of infrastructure and the lack of need for a project like this.

Stephen Sacks