

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee <https://edhapac.org>

"Non-Partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future Since 1981" 1021 Harvard Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762



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

June 25, 2025

Planning Commission June 26, 2025 Agenda item 25-1066

- General - Our primary concern is funding specific, and having citizens pay for expansions if they are 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.
- Feedback included on non-EDH projects to cover citizen concerns about all road projects in the county, due to resources needed by DOT to address the needs.
- 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*
- **CIP 36105042 – White Rock Road Widening.**
 - 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?
 - Were any traffic studies conducted that led to this decision? If so, can that be provided for review?
 - What safety concern or existing deficiency is driving this request for addition?
 - What is the current LOS for this roadway section?
 - Our understanding of analysis for projected growth is that it must use existing zoning on parcels. With current zoning, what growth is anticipated supporting this CIP project addition?
 - The presentation provided to BOS on March 11th included a reference for TIF fees, which made it seem like those would be used. Yet the Planning Commission findings review says no part of TIF.
 - Is White Rock part of the Southeast Connector JPA? If so, would there be funding from that? Is that why TC-1k is included?
 - In the BOS presentation of March 11th, 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?

- **CIP 36105022 – Headington Road Extension**
 - The reason behind this request is not included in the 2025 Annual CIP section of the Findings of Consistency Memo like the other projects. However, there is a note included in the 2025 Project Change Table
 - Project fell out of the TIF Program and funded CIP following approval of The Crossings - El Dorado RV Resort and Campground project and removed from the General Plan and Circulation Map
 - Was this a condition of approval (or similar requirement) in the project, or is it no longer going to be a road at all?
 - If it is not going to be a road at all, then will this be designated as a closed or cancelled project? It doesn't say it is going back to unfunded list, so want to have clear understanding of disposition.
 - If the project developer must complete the roadway, then will it be done in timing to benefit the citizens in that area? Asking since their TIF fees are delayed for 5 years (with interest) so building can begin prior. Also to ensure there are no safety issues introduced.
- **CIP 36105085 and 36105086 – Grizzly Flat Bridge and Lotus Road Guardrails.**
 - There is nothing explaining both of these. We can guess that the guardrails is safety related, but what is the purpose for the Grizzly Flat Bridge addition?
- **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 do not cover identified funding source(s). If this statement is true, what are the funding sources for all projects?
- **TC-4b and 4c** are referenced in findings, so does that mean a bikeway is being included in any of these projects? Are there any plan outlines or diagrams yet to support these policy references?
- **HO-1.26** How exactly do any of these requests relate to affordable housing? This seems like a disconnected element, knowing the zones and areas for these roadways.
- **TC-Xi** None of these projects appear to have anything to do with Highway 50, so how does this support any of the requests?
- **Unfunded List**
 - a. There are a few “Safety” items identified by County Studies in the list. Why are all the above projects prioritized above those?
 - b. Similarly, there a lot of “Potentially Safety” projects from Public Outreach. What is being done to allocate County resources to determine if they are really safety issues, and prioritize accordingly?

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

“Non-Partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future Since 1981”