

S. Taylor BOS 12/12/16 #1

12-12-16 BOS Comments, Measure E Workshop

According to the Measure E workshops, the County came to the conclusion that El Dorado Hills is not at LOS F. If the Board of Supervisors has concluded that we have not reached LOS F in El Dorado Hills, then why are we here today?

In reality, the Measure E workshops should have addressed current deficiencies in the County's road infrastructure in order to establish current level of services on our highways, arterial roads, and their intersections. Since that was never determined, there is no data to address the current Housing Element. The only data supplied by the staff report was an Adequate Sites Analysis Map, a 20-year projection which is beyond the scope of the Housing Element and does not include intersections. Do we have a map for today's levels of service?

According to Table HO28 of the 2013-2021 Housing Element, we currently have a potential surplus of 2,387 very low to moderate units above what is required for RHNA. Additionally, we have a potential surplus of 14,404 above moderate units over what is required for RHNA. Again, why are we here today?

In reference to State Code 65863, Measure E has not changed the number of parcels, nor has it reduced the residential density for any of those parcels, identified in the Housing Element to accommodate RHNA.

Measure E did not change the fee waiver (offset) program to assist affordable housing projects.

According to the Housing Element, the County has anticipated 408 second units to be built during 2013-2021, but it does not appear that these units were applied to the vacant housing inventory for the very low, low, or moderate units for the RHNA numbers.

First Choice Recommendation: Follow Option A. Since 70% of the parcels zoned for multi-family uses have a Design Control or Historical overlay (making them discretionary), developing and adopting design standards will provide for ministerial review for affordable multi-family development on those parcels while complying with the General Plan.

Second Choice Recommendation: Acknowledge that Measure E does not impact our Housing Element and stop wasting taxpayer funds on problems that don't exist.

Sue Taylor
Save Our County

1 of 3

identified for residential use, which are summarized in the vacant land survey (Appendix B). Table B-3 provides detail on vacant land available by zone district within the County’s established communities. Table B-4 provides detail on underutilized sites were General Plan land use designations, zoning, lot sizes, physical conditions, and available infrastructure can accommodate increased development opportunities.

Table HO28
2013 Land Inventory Summary –El Dorado County

	Income Category			
	VL/L	Mod	Above	Total
Units approved or under construction	108	2	124	234
Entitlements (lots)*	--	--	5,762	5,762
Vacant land - residential	2,338	764	10,151	13,253
- West Slope	2,134	675	6,720	9,529
- East Slope	204	89	3,431	3,724
Vacant land – commercial/mixed use	257	--	--	257
Underutilized land – residential	925	148	0	1,073
Potential second units**	406	0	0	406
Subtotal	4,034	914	16,037	20,985
RHNA (net 2013-2021)	1,740	821	1,633	4,194
Surplus (Deficit)	2,294	93	14,404	16,791

Source: El Dorado County Community Development Agency. 7/2013
 * Includes Approved Specific Plans, Tentative and Parcel maps west slope only
 ** Estimated 4% of Vacant land – residential, "Above"

Vacant Land Survey Methodology

The vacant land survey is a summary of information contained in the County Assessor’s database. The County ran a query for vacant parcels assigned zoning designations that would allow residential development. These data were summarized for residential development suitability by zone district within each community. The assumptions for this survey, including categorization of development potential by income category, are found in the Introduction to Appendix B.

Financial and Administrative Resources

The County of El Dorado has access to a variety of funding sources available for affordable housing activities. They include programs from local, state, federal, and private sources. The following section describes the most significant housing resources in El Dorado County. All of these programs are administered by the El Dorado County Health and Human Services Agency. The Health and Human Services Agency functions as the Housing Authority Agent for the Board of Supervisors.

2 of 3

**Executive Summary: Table 1 - Allocations - Total and by Income Category
SACOG 2013-2021 RHNA - FINAL ALLOCATIONS**

	Total Updated Projected Growth (Jan 1, 2013-October 31, 2021)										Combined Low + Very Low Income	
	Total number of Units (based on proportion of MTP/SCS 2020 projection)		Very Low Income		Low Income		Moderate		Above Moderate		Low Income	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Placerville	372		78	21.0%	55	14.8%	69	18.5%	170	45.7%	133	35.8%
South Lake Tahoe ¹	336		54	16.1%	38	11.3%	63	18.8%	181	53.9%	92	27.4%
El Dorado Uninc Tahoe Basin ¹	480		132	27.5%	93	19.4%	89	18.5%	166	34.6%	225	46.9%
El Dorado Uninc	3,948		954	24.2%	669	16.9%	734	18.6%	1,591	40.3%	1,623	41.1%
El Dorado County total	5,136		1,218	23.7%	855	16.6%	955	18.6%	2,108	41.0%	2,073	40.4%
Auburn	308		74	24.0%	52	16.9%	57	18.5%	125	40.6%	126	40.9%
Colfax	51		10	19.6%	7	13.7%	10	19.6%	24	47.1%	17	33.3%
Lincoln	3,790		953	25.1%	668	17.6%	705	18.6%	1,464	38.6%	1,621	42.8%
Loomis	154		39	25.3%	27	17.5%	29	18.8%	59	38.3%	66	42.9%
Rocklin	3,813		1,040	27.3%	729	19.1%	709	18.6%	1,335	35.0%	1,769	46.4%
Roseville	8,478		2,268	26.8%	1,590	18.8%	1,577	18.6%	3,043	35.9%	3,858	45.5%
Placer Uninc Tahoe Basin ¹	328		90	27.4%	63	19.2%	61	18.6%	114	34.8%	153	46.6%
Placer Uninc	4,703		1,275	27.1%	894	19.0%	875	18.6%	1,659	35.3%	2,169	46.1%
Placer County total	21,625		5,749	26.6%	4,030	18.6%	4,023	18.6%	7,823	36.2%	9,779	45.2%
Citrus Heights	696		146	21.0%	102	14.7%	130	18.7%	318	45.7%	248	35.6%
Elk Grove	7,402		2,035	27.5%	1,427	19.3%	1,377	18.6%	2,563	34.6%	3,462	46.8%
Folsom	4,633		1,218	26.3%	854	18.4%	862	18.6%	1,699	36.7%	2,072	44.7%
Galt	679		131	19.3%	91	13.4%	126	18.6%	331	48.7%	222	32.7%
Isleton	23		4	17.4%	3	13.0%	4	17.4%	12	52.2%	7	30.4%
Rancho Cordova	7,008		1,539	22.0%	1,079	15.4%	1,303	18.6%	3,087	44.0%	2,618	37.4%
Sacramento	24,101		4,944	20.5%	3,467	14.4%	4,482	18.6%	11,208	46.5%	8,411	34.9%
Sacramento Uninc	13,844		3,149	22.7%	2,208	15.9%	2,574	18.6%	5,913	42.7%	5,357	38.7%
Sacramento County total	58,386		13,166	22.5%	9,231	15.8%	10,858	18.6%	25,131	43.0%	22,397	38.4%
Live Oak	449		104	23.2%	72	16.0%	83	18.5%	190	42.3%	176	39.2%
Yuba City	2,679		624	23.3%	437	16.3%	498	18.6%	1,120	41.8%	1,061	39.6%
Sutter Uninc	335		85	25.4%	60	17.9%	62	18.5%	128	38.2%	145	43.3%
Sutter County total	3,463		813	23.5%	569	16.4%	643	18.6%	1,438	41.5%	1,382	39.9%
Davis	1,066		248	23.3%	174	16.3%	198	18.6%	446	41.8%	422	39.6%
West Sacramento	5,977		1,316	22.0%	923	15.4%	1,111	18.6%	2,627	44.0%	2,239	37.5%
Winters	319		76	23.8%	54	16.9%	59	18.5%	130	40.8%	130	40.8%
Woodland	1,877		390	20.8%	274	14.6%	349	18.6%	864	46.0%	664	35.4%
Yolo Uninc	1,890		427	22.6%	299	15.8%	351	18.6%	813	43.0%	726	38.4%
Yolo County total	11,129		2,457	22.1%	1,724	15.5%	2,068	18.6%	4,880	43.8%	4,181	37.6%

3 of 3