



El Dorado Hills Citizens
Alliance
<alliance@edhca.net>
06/30/2008 09:23 AM

To Rusty Dupray <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Helen
Baumann <bostwo@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Jack Sweeney
<bosthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Ron Briggs
cc El Dorado Hills Citizens Alliance <alliance@edhca.net>, Paul
Raveling <Paul.Raveling@sierrafoot.org>, Hal Erpenbeck
<halerp@comcast.net>, John and Fran Thomson
bcc
Subject **Additional notes on Measure Y and proposed replacement in
the General Plan**

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
2008 JUN 30 AM 11:26
SUBJECT

Supervisors,

This is a short set of additional notes from the El Dorado Hills Citizens Alliance on this subject, for your consideration at tomorrow's board meeting. This is agenda item 57 for Amendment A08-00005.

The overall summary is that the Citizens Alliance supports the changes, but our core membership has some significant reservations. We have discussed this in our core group and have taken a vote of our board of directors on this publicly sensitive subject. This email adds some finer details based on my own interpretation at a slightly finer level of detail for areas of concern to the Citizens Alliance.

In consideration of the alternative actions identified in the staff report we recommend that the Board consider submitting both the new proposal and the original language of Measure Y to the voters in this November's General Election.

The most important reasons we support the proposed amendment are:

- It retains a requirement to fully fund road system improvements needed to mitigate traffic impacts from single family residential development.
- It permits use of additional funding sources for road system improvements.
- It is a significant advancement in cooperation between historically competing factions. This increases the chance for additional productive agreement in the future.

Our most important concerns are:

- Planning decisions for El Dorado Hills need to recognize the limitations of developing to urban land use densities on an existing road network which cannot feasibly be altered from a rural pattern to a fully urban pattern. As with many parts of the General Plan, El Dorado Hills needs specializations which differ from those appropriate to the County as a whole.
- For any given LOS actual trip time on the El Dorado Hills road system is much slower than the same LOS provides elsewhere in the County due to our density of traffic lights and stop signs. It is more appropriate to specify a minimum requirement of LOS C than

LOS E in El Dorado Hills.

- By explicitly limiting the General Plan's policy to single family residential it omits General Plan coverage for multifamily residential, commercial, industrial, and research & development land uses. In terms of traffic impacts these land uses are more critical than SFR, they generate more trips per day per unit of land area. Ordinarily we expect these impacts to be addressed in Development Agreements and environmental review for large projects. We would be more comfortable if the General Plan amendments would specify that the County shall be prohibited from finding that development will produce significant and unavoidable impacts: All impacts should be mitigated. For non-SFR land uses it follows that the County is fully responsible for identifying how this mitigation is funded and for securing that funding.
- We have some concerns that relaxation of the requirement for development to fully fund traffic mitigation could increase budget stress for other County programs if the Board of Supervisors chooses to redirect General Fund revenues for purposes of traffic mitigation.

Many in the general public will be concerned that this provision could result in tax increases. We understand that under Proposition 208 this cannot occur without concurrence of a supermajority of the voters, and that the value in this provision is to permit use of other funding sources, such as federal and state matching funds. It may be appropriate for the language of this provision to clarify that point.

- We would strongly prefer that the relaxed concurrency requirements in Policy TC-Xe require inclusion of mitigation measures in the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan rather than the 20-year CIP. The historic record has shown that projects in a 5-year CIP frequently are delayed by 10 to 20 years: We need higher priority for traffic mitigation.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Paul Raveling, president
El Dorado Hills Citizens Alliance
Reply to alliance@edhca.net
or Paul.Raveling@sierrafoot.org
Web site: <http://www.edhca.net>

(916) 933-5826 Personal home and home office
(916) 849-5826 Cell phone
Usually Wednesdays and Thursdays:
(650) 506-8393 Office at Oracle Headquarters