

From: [Linda Campbell](#)
To: [David Spaur](#); [Bob Williams](#); [Jeff Hansen](#); [Tim Costello](#); [Patrick Frega](#); [Rafael Martinez](#); [Planning Department](#)
Cc: [BOS-District I](#); [BOS-District II](#); [BOS-District III](#); [BOS-District IV](#); [BOS-District V](#); [John Davey](#); [Bill Jamaca](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Planning Commission April 10 Agenda Item 2
Date: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 4:15:05 PM
Attachments: [Planning Commission April 10 Agenda Item 2.pdf](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello Planning,

Attached is feedback for the Planning Commission agenda item 2 on April 10, 2025.

This represents input from the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), Transportation Subcommittee.

We would appreciate having the attached document added to the agenda item as public comment.

Thank you,
Linda Campbell
EDH APAC Transportation Committee Chair



APAC 2025 Officers

John Davey, Chair jdavey@daveygroup.net

John Raslear, Vice Chair jirazzpub@sbcglobal.net

Timothy White, Vice Chair tjwhitejd@gmail.com

Brooke Washburn, Vice Chair Washburn_bew@yahoo.com

Bill Jamaca, Secretary bjamaca@gmail.com

April 9, 2025

Planning Commission April 10, 2025 Agenda item 2

- What is the reason for going to board first to get approval to include in CIP, then going back to the Planning Commission to approve that it is consistent with the General Plan? This seems to be a very inefficient flow, particularly since the BOS approved without all information that could have been helpful. What will happen now if found not consistent by Planning Commission?
- Our primary concern is funding specific, and having citizens pay for expansions like this based solely on yet to be approved projects, rather than conditioning developers to contribute. That would be inconsistent with the General Plan. Grants are still taxpayer money.
- Specific feedback and questions related to Findings of Consistency:
 1. Statement from Findings of Consistency document: *Since these projects are not needed to accommodate new development, they do not meet the nexus requirements pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and are not eligible for TIF funding. Non-TIF funded CIP projects include bike/pedestrian facilities, bridge replacement projects, and projects that address a safety concern or existing deficiency.*
 - a. What safety concern or existing deficiency is driving both requests for addition?
 - b. What is the current LOS for both projects? Trying to determine if that is a factor to consider with addition to CIP.
 - c. Our understanding of analysis for projected growth is that it must use existing zoning on parcels. Meaning it cannot leverage any pending project applications. With current zoning, what growth is anticipated supporting both CIP project additions?
 - d. Were any traffic studies conducted that led to these decisions? If so, can those be provided for review?
 - e. In March 11th meeting, there was reference to a “daily traffic data collection” effort that was done for Latrobe, so that data would be helpful.
 - f. Please confirm that Latrobe is not being driven by any pending project applications.
 - g. Similar to above, if there are safety concerns, then we did not see those listed in any documents.

- h. If there is a deficiency, then was it from any previously approved projects that were not correctly conditioned for approval? If so, then is that being addressed in the review of future project applications?
 - i. TC-4b and 4c are referenced in findings, so does that mean a bikeway is being included in both road projects? Are there any plan outlines or diagrams yet to support these policy references?
- 2. Statement from Findings of Consistency: *The Board may add a project from the unfunded list once funding has been identified.*
 - a. The documents for this agenda item state that TIF cannot be used but does not cover identified funding source(s). If this statement is true, then it does not appear to be consistent for addition.
 - b. The presentation provided to BOS on March 11th included a reference to TIF fees, which made it seem like those would be used. Yet the Planning Commission findings review says no part of TIF.
 - c. Is White Rock part of the Southeast Connector JPA? If so, would there be funding from that?
 - d. In the BOS presentation of March 11th, only the Latrobe Road project was listed, although it was included in the project change table. However, there was a verbal reference to the White Rock Rd. request since “a little warehouse chain was coming to Silva Valley”. So, is the full \$14M White Rock estimate going to only be paid by citizens, or will this potential project have conditions included to provide some funding if, in fact, the widening is due to volume because of them?
- 3. What exactly is being done on Latrobe Road? The White Rock item reflects expansion to 4 lanes, but Latrobe is undefined to determine the intended road classification (TC-1a).
- 4. How exactly is HO-1.26 tying into this request related to affordable housing? This seems like a disconnected element, knowing the zones and areas for both roadways.

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee
“Non-Partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future Since 1981”