



public comment
#64 26-0765
BOS Rwd 6/22/26

I support for Agenda Item #26-0765.

From laurie rinker <lprinker@gmail.com>
Date Sat 6/20/2026 6:44 AM
To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear clerk of court,

I am not in support of Costco coming to El Dorado Hills, but if it does come, I fervently believe that since El Dorado Hills will be receiving all of the impact, including my adjacent neighborhood village D2 in Serrano, that EDH should receive a good portion of the tax benefits to help with the negative impact on our infrastructure.

To restate my opinion " I would like the County Counsel and the Chief Administrative Officer to identify methods to assure that if the proposed Costco is approved and begins operation in El Dorado Hills, a portion of the revenue be deposited in a special account dedicated to road improvements and maintenance in El Dorado Hills, 95762 (District 1, 2 & 4). The monies for this account will be in addition to any other available funds for general roads in El Dorado Hills.

Our community would bear many of the Costco project impacts, including traffic, infrastructure demands, public safety needs, and other local concerns. We believe it is reasonable to begin a conversation about ensuring El Dorado Hills receives a fair share of the revenue to help address those impacts.

Thank you,
Laurie and Ed Rinker
5053 Mertola Dr.,
El Dorado Hills, Ca
415-209-8659

Public comment #64
BOS Recd 6/22/26 26-0765



Legistar 26-0765 June 23, 2026 Agenda Item 64

From John Davey <jdavey@daveygroup.net>

Date Mon 6/22/2026 7:15 AM

To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>; BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Supervisors,

I would like to offer my comments for the Legistar 26-0765 June 23, 2026 Agenda Item 64.

I support the concept of finding an equitable methodology in regards to the proposed EDH Costco project to reserve a portion of the revenue to be deposited in a special account dedicated to road improvements and maintenance in El Dorado Hills, 95762 (District 1, 2 & 4).

My comments in regard to this agenda item are solely my own, and do not represent the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee, where I serve as chair.

For myself, over the course of many years of reviewing proposed development projects in El Dorado Hills, finding community benefits to offset negative impacts of development projects in our El Dorado Hills Community has always been a critical concern.

Traffic mitigation seems to always rest on meeting the lowest requirements to gain project entitlements, and seldom considers the ongoing maintenance impacts on El Dorado Hills roadways. However, traffic mitigation is more than just funding capacity improvements - our roads suffer from a lack of meaningful maintenance funding, which is a significant cost to the County over time.

Some consideration for local impacts is established through project development agreements. However, the portions of development agreement 'gains' to the County are often targeted to specific county-wide special funds. For example, contributions to the low-income housing fund are often insubstantial, such as \$500 per parcel/building permit, requiring massive development projects to achieve any significant funding contribution to assist low-income housing opportunities. And because these contributions are piecemeal over a 20- or 30-year timeline of a development agreement, the special fund dollars are worth considerably less than intended at the time of project entitlements. The balance of most development agreement benefits frequently are targeted towards additional funding for infrastructure requirements of the project, or the County General Fund.

In this instance, there is no proposed development agreement associated with the EDH Costco project. This results in no opportunity to consider capturing additional benefits as part of the project entitlement process.

Where possible, development mitigation and associated funding should be targeted towards the communities that are impacted.

As the largest population center in the County, and to be blunt, the community where the majority of all significant development occurs, the roadway network in El Dorado Hills requires significant maintenance effort and funding.

Some EDH neighbors have offered that the effort to reserve a portion of revenues from the EDH Costco project essentially concedes that the project will obtain its entitlements. For those neighbors, this suggests the County is advocating for the project before all of the impacts have been adequately analyzed and considered. While I understand and respect their thoughts on the matter, I believe that specifying these Commercial Regional Zoning parcels in El Dorado Hills for reserving a portion of revenue for road network maintenance, regardless of the specific project, makes sense. Commercial Regional zoning by nature generates significantly more traffic and road impacts, requiring higher levels of ongoing maintenance. So I support this initial effort to determine how this can be equitably established for our El Dorado Hills Community.

As the agenda item details, it is absolutely necessary to establish this potential revenue for road maintenance as ancillary to any other available funds for general road maintenance. It should not replace other available funds for road maintenance, but should bolster those funds.

I also believe that there should be language included that will preserve the proposed funding, so that it cannot be diverted to other purposes once it is established.

The El Dorado Hills Community has experienced a large and sustained cycle of growth over many decades. Beyond this effort to establish additional road maintenance funding from the proposed Commercial Regional Zoned project, I believe that as a County we should consider developing a funding solution for maintaining the El Dorado Hills' road network with a solution similar to the past Missouri Flat Area Master Circulation and Financing Plan (MC&FP) - establishing dedicated funding of the road network in the largest development area in El Dorado County.

I encourage the Board to pursue this study and determine how to enact the proposed Agenda item.

Respectfully,

John Davey
El Dorado Hills, CA

Public Comment BOS Agenda Item 64, June 23

From LINDA CAMPBELL <lcampbell03@comcast.net>

Date Mon 6/22/2026 3:16 PM

To BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>; BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Clerk of the Board,

Please publish this email as public comment on the related agenda item. Thank you.

Public Comment BOS Agenda item 64 June 23-2026 - Legistar 26-0765

Hello Supervisors,

Below is my feedback on statements within the text provided in the agenda item.

- **Statement:** "...the proposed El Dorado Hills Costco will provide county-wide economic benefits..."
 - This is a broad statement without clear supporting evidence. There was no true Economic or Financial Impact Analysis delivered with the Draft EIR. If in fact the citizens will be paying for infrastructure costs via our taxes along, how long would it take to be "in the black" after all impacts are completed? How many other businesses might close, thereby simply shifting sales tax, not increasing?
- **Statement:** "...Establishing a special revenue account is essential ..."
 - County Policy TC-Xa(5) states that "The County **shall not** create an Infrastructure Financing District unless allowed by a 2/3rds majority vote of the people within that district."
 - This was done for the Missouri Flat area in cooperation with the businesses there. Not only was sales tax used, but property taxes were also incorporated with agreement from the businesses. Pretty sure that did not fully accomplish the objectives that were set, and controls were not consistent since some of the funds were used in other areas of the county. This current proposal does not appear to have Costco participating.
- **Statement:** Unmitigated Traffic Volumes.
 - There is feedback to the DEIR about the Statement of Overriding Considerations, meaning the County would acknowledge the project causing permanent, negative impacts to our community that cannot be fixed, but they believe the economic benefits are more important than the environmental or public costs. I am hopeful that is not the position the board is taking on the project.

- This request seems to confirm that the applicant may not be required to participate in mitigation, which would violate policies TC-Xd, TC-Xe, TC-Xf and TC-Xg.
- Here specifically is the text from TC-Xg:
- Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way, **design and construct or fund** any improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. **The County shall require** an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way **and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development.** This policy shall remain in effect indefinitely unless amended by voters.
- **Statement:** “Although current capacity exists...”
 - This is a deceptive statement because, although we do have roadways, none of them have sufficient capacity to support this project. It is not just about accelerated deterioration of local roads and internal infrastructure. The proposal is for the public to fund roadway expansions rather than require the applicant to do what is required according to our general plan policies.
- **Statement:** “... a dedicated account ensures that tax revenue generated by this specific project is reinvested directly into the impacted 95762 corridors rather than being absorbed into the General Fund.”
 - What about the other things that are supposed to be covered by the monies going into the general fund? Would this reduce our reserves and preparation for disaster emergencies? The whole county would need that.
- **Statement:** “Dedicated funding will support the intensive rehabilitation and long-term maintenance of high-traffic arterials, specifically Silva Valley Parkway, Bass Lake Road, Green Valley Road, and surrounding residential collector streets impacted by increased commercial cut-through traffic.”
 - It is great to see significant roadways like Bass Lake and Green Valley included in the agenda item, particularly since Green Valley was totally excluded from the Costco traffic analysis, and Bass Lake was only reviewed at the Hwy 50 interchange, not further north where traffic would increase to connect down Serrano Parkway. Those were major exclusions noted in DEIR feedback.
 - Since 95762 was referenced as a designation, at what point in each roadway does the zip code change? This would mean anything beyond that would stay constrained, even though traffic would increase from this project.
 - The impact of the Costco project is not just about rehabilitation; it is about significant expansion requirements. It is not about money, as much as it is about engineering, clear planning and prioritization.

Conclusion

As a county we will receive 1.25% of the sales tax, 1% of which goes to general fund and .25% which goes to transportation. Considering that sales tax is only paid on non-food items, we should really have realistic numbers before trying to allocate a financing district with taxpayer money to attempt to cover the massive extent of roadway expansions required to get us to general plan requirements for every level of service failure that should be mitigated. I believe this impact will go well into our county beyond the listed roadways in 95762.

As a general reference, CEQA section 15126.4 requires lead agencies to propose and consider feasible mitigation measures to minimize or avoid a project’s significant environmental impacts. Formulation of mitigation measures shall not be deferred until some future time.

Measures must be roughly proportional to the impact of the project and must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments.

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/14-CCR-15126.4>

I can understand the attempt to consider something in advance, and I am sure that Costco would like to leverage this proposal as an alternative to them being required to mitigate, but this should wait until after the Final EIR is available for discussion, public input and decision on approval or denial. The public should not have to suffer the significant negative impacts of this project but instead require the applicant to do what is required on all roadways according to our general plan policies.

Regards,

Linda K Campbell