

# Support for LUPPU & Southe ast Capitol Conne ctor

4 messages

#### Debbie Manning <debbie@eldoradohillschamber.org>

Fri, Jun 21, 2013 at 10:18 AM

To: jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us

Cc: The BOSONE <br/>
bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>,<br/>
bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, "Abraham, T" <tabraham@marshallmedical.org>, "Anderson, Linda Ellen"<br/>
<leanderson888@gmail.com>, "Barri, Kevin" <Kevin.J.Barri@wellsfargo.com>, "Cort, Cathey" <ccort@adsuptoday.com>, "England, Jeff"<br/>
<JeffE@wasteconnections.com>, "Jensen, Brian" <BLJc@pge.com>, "Jensen, Brian" <br/>
<br/>
lauriedishman@gmail.com>, "Nero, Theresa" <Theresa.Nero@dignityhealth.org>, "Sharp, Charles" <Charles.Sharp@blueshieldca.com>,<br/>
"Sharp, Charles" <csharp13@gmail.com>, Ted Addison <taddison55@comcast.net>, "Wall, Virginia" <Virginia.Wall@dignityhealth.org>,<br/>
"Williamson, Dave" <dawilliamson@ft.newyorklife.com>, "Zezini, John" <John.Zezini@edwardjones.com>

Attached is a letter of support for the LUPPU and the Southeast Capitol Connector.

The original will be mailed today.

Best,

Debbie

## Debbie Manning

President & CEO

El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce

California Welcome Center

2085 Vine Street, Suite 105

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

916-933-1335 EXT 1#

FAX 916-933-5908

www.eldoradohillschamber.org

### Upcoming events:

- Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>: *Mraz Brewing Company's Ribbon Cutting AND MIXER!* 5:30pm to 7:30pm (2222 Francisco Dr., EDH) No registration required
- Friday, July 12th: Power Luncheon TBD (Mixer with Folsom, Rancho Cordova & EDH Chamber Members) 11:30am 1:00pm
- Tuesday, July 23rd: EDH & EDC Chamber Mixer at David Girard Vineyards 5:30pm 7:30pm
- Wednesday, July 31st: New Member Orientation 5:30pm 6:30pm

This communication, together with any attachments hereto or links contained herein, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) an **Publicity Communication** to confidential or legally protected. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, disseminated the communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail message and delete the original and all copies of the communication, along with any attachments hereto or links herein, from your system.

EL DORADO HILLS

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

June 21, 2013

Supervisor Ron Mikulaco Supervisor Ray Nutting Supervisor Brian Veerkamp Supervisor Ron Briggs Supervisor Norma Santiago County of El Dorado 330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

RE: LUPPA & Southeast Capitol Connector

Dear Supervisors,

The El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors support the ongoing LUPPU (Land Use Policy Programmatic Update) effort and urges the Board of Supervisors to not make any major land use decisions prior to receiving, reviewing and fully comprehending the work being completed under LUPPU.

The Chamber also recommends the following:

- 1. Follow the established LUPPU Process
- 2. Analyze all data/facts when all analyses are complete
- 3. Make Land-use decision based on the data/facts

The Chamber went on record March 4, 2013 (letter included) to support the Southeast Capital Connector. The Chamber further recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

- 1. El Dorado County remains in the JPA.
- 2. To include the Silva Valley Parkway Interchange into the JPA funding program.
- 3. To seek as much state and federal funding as possible to assist in the funding of the Silva Valley Parkway Interchange and White Rock Road.
- 4. We further recommend these additional transportation dollars are secured for the community and the County program additional transportation projects that will help the business community prosper. For example, program the connection between Saratoga to Ironpoint.

Respectfully,

Janning

Debbie Manning President & CEO

Public Comment 12-1290 5E

Home of the California Welcome Center

**Public Comment** 

March 4, 2013

Supervisor Ron Mikulaco Supervisor Ray Nutting Supervisor Brian Veerkamp Supervisor Ron Briggs Supervisor Norma Santiago County of El Dorado 330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667



Dear Supervisors,

In anticipation of the upcoming vote of the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority on the project's 2012 Initial Plan of Finance, on behalf of the El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce I wanted to convey our support for moving this project forward due primarily to its economic development benefits.

As indicated in the Connector economic impact study released in December, the region overall will realize significant job gains by moving forward with the project's construction. Of the 25,000 additional direct and indirect jobs anticipated by 2035, we would expect a significant number of those to materialize in El Dorado Hills. Our 900-acre business park, currently home to 200 companies, in particular stands to benefit from the Connector's implementation. Efficient access to and from current and prospective business park employers is a key issue in ensuring that area's near-term and longer-term competitiveness.

Other parts of the region have moved forward with large-scale transportation infrastructure projects, such as the Sacramento International Airport expansion and the Highway 65 Lincoln Bypass in Placer County. We can't afford to be left further behind, especially when it's anticipated that the overall economic impact of the Connector would be similar to or perhaps even exceed those other regional projects.

The Connector's role in improving linkages between population and employment centers – including in El Dorado Hills – and attracting new business of all kinds to the region makes it imperative that we make it happen. And it needs to happen with El Dorado County's active involvement if our area is to realize its full benefits.

We encourage Supervisor Mikulaco's vote in support of the Plan of Finance when it comes before the JPA Board on March 8 and look forward to working with you to ensure that the project is implemented so that it works for El Dorado Hills residents and businesses.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debbie Manning President/CEO cc: Council Member Pat Hume, City of Elk Grove Supervisor Don Nottoli, Sacramento County Council Member David Sander, City of Rancho Cordova Council Member Jeff Starsky, City of Folsom

> Public Comment 12-1290 5E

> > .



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

# Withdraw from the JPA, PLEASE.

1 message

James D Clark <jnvicki@pacbell.net> To: bosthree@edcgov.us Cc: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Tue, Jun 25, 2013 at 4:18 AM

Supervisor Three, Brian Veerkamp,

After learning about this I am quite upset. I am very sure that the majority of taxpayers have not read this. How could a county do this to those who live in beautiful EI Dorado County?

If I am understanding this correctly?

I keep noticing the same pattern in different forms. It is called the taxpayers pay for everything. This is a good example and very costly one for the taxpayers. Developers, investors, builders, large retail stores, etc. want things to benefit them so that they can make a larger profit, Capitalism. Problem, the taxpayers pay for it, in order for the city or county to receive the golden tax increments. Which the cities and counties will always continue to need more to support all that they have chosen to bring here. Example: police, fire, schools, more roads, more traffic, more noise, more crime, and an entire way of life, gone for our children and grandchildren. The population in the state of Calif. is going down, not up. With the continuation of these policies you are just making more individuals and companies move out to California. We will soon look like another city off of the freeway like Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Stockton, Gilroy, San Jose, Livermore, and Pleasanton, some of which, were rural not that long ago. Now you go from city to city with no gaps in between . Not a place people want to go visit, just pass through.

Someone decides to start their own business or company. Their building needs repaired, remodeled, road repaired, new building, new signage, redevelopment would have taken care of that, taxpayers? The builders need to start putting in more money for schools, roads, and infrastructure, let's now have Mello-Roos to pick up some of the cost for the builders and developers. We build roads and make transportation plans that we do not have the money for, but we will, some will appear as soon as we figure a way to get the taxpayers to pay for it. Example the second Phase of Placerville Drive that there is no money for. At least last time OJust get the taxpayers to pick up that one. Or we can find a grant, taxpayers again. What do these business pay for??

Does prop 281 come into play on any of this? Voter Approval for Local Government Taxes, Limitations on Assessments and charges? How is this happening without the vote of the people? (I doubt, that if this were on a ballot that this would pass). Could someone, please, educate me on this bill? http://vote96.sos.ca.gov/ Vote96/html/BP/218.htm

PLEASE WITHDRAW FROM THE JPA!!!! before making the taxpayers pay for all of this in the future. We will have jobs? Retail?

"The board will not exercise its power of eminent domain with the jurisdiction of a Member without that effected Member's body's prior consideration and concurrences". If I recall correctly some one is being evicted by eminent domain due to the Silva Valley Interchange. If I recall correctly the county handed it over to the Cal Trans to take care of? (Article in the MD a while back).

Then there are special assessments, taxes and Mello-Roos. "Obtain and secure funding from all available public and private sources including local, state, and federal government, including but not limited to, bond insurances, lease purchase agreements, public grants, private contributions, public and private loans and other funds. Lew and collect, or cause to be collected, transportation impact fees on new residential, commercial, and industrial development, as authorized by local, state, and federal law.

Form special assessment district under ANY legal authority that exists now or in the future in the f

Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act or any other authority that may exist now or in the future.

### AMENDMENT NO. 1

### JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT

### FOR THE ELK GROVE - RANCHO CORDOVA - EL DORADO

### CONNECTOR AUTHORITY

The Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement establishing the Elk Grove – Rancho Cordova – El Dorado Connector Authority (commonly known as the Capital SouthEast Connector JPA"), dated December 12, 2006 (the "Agreement"), by and among the City of Elk Grove, the County of Sacramento, the City of Rancho Cordova, the City of Folsom, and the County of El Dorado (collectively the "Members"), is amended effective on the last date executed by all partiesMay 1, 2013, as follows:

1. Section 3 of the Agreement, entitled "Term and Termination", is amended to read as follows:

3. Term and Termination. This Agreement shall be effective as of the date first written above. It shall remain in effect until (a) the purpose stated in Section 1 of the Agreement is fully accomplished, (b) until terminated by vote of a majority of the Members then participating; or (c) automatically upon the withdrawal of a majority of its Members. The Agreement may not be terminated if (i) all bonds and other instruments of indebtedness issued by the Authority, if any, have not been paid in full or provision has not been made for payment in full, or (ii) all outstanding obligations and liabilities of the Authority have not been paid in full or provision has not been paid in full or provision has not been made for payment in full. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any Member may withdraw its membership from the Authority upon 10 days written notice to each Member so long as no bonds or other instruments of indebtedness have been consented to by the Member under Section 7.b. which have not been paid in full or provisions have not been made for full payment, and provided that the Member has not received proceeds from bonds issued by the Authority for the Connector Project which have not been paid in full or for which there is no provision for full payment.

Section 7 of the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, entitled "Voting," is amended as follows:

Section 7.a. is amended to read:

a" The affirmative vote of at least four directors is required to exercise the powers of eminent domain and to amend the Functional Guidelines referenced in Section 1 of this Agreement. The Board will not exercise its power of eminent domain within the jurisdiction of a Member without the affected Member's governing body's prior consideration and concurrence."

12-1290 5B Page 2 of 4

Section 7.b.1. is amended to read:

"b. The unanimous affirmative vote of all five of the directors, and the prior consent of the affected Member's governing body, is required to take any of the following actions, and no allocation of cost or other financial obligation shall be imposed upon or constitute a valid financial obligation of a Member unless that Member's governing body first considers and expressly assumes that cost or financial obligation:

1. Adopt a Funding Plan, as referenced in Section 5.d. of this Agreement; however, a Member's independent policy board must consider and consent to the imposition of a financial obligation upon the independent Member entity."

2. Establish start-up contributions from Members, as referenced in Section 6.d.(5) of this Pagneer from ment 12-1290 5E

3. Obtain and secure funding from all available public and private sources including local, state, and federal government, including but not limited to, bond issuance's, lease purchase agreements, public grants, private

contributions, public and private loans, and other funds,;

4. Levy and collect, or cause to be collected, transportation impact fees on new residential, commercial, and industrial development, as authorized by local, state, and federal law;

5. Form a special assessment district under any legal authority that exists now or in the future, including, without limitation, the Improvement Act of 1911 (Streets & Highways Code Section 5000 et seq.), the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 (Streets & Highways code Section 10000 et seq.), and the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 (Streets & Highways Code Section 8500 et seq.), as authorized by local, state, and federal law;

6. Form a special tax district under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act or any other authority that may exist now or in the future;

7. Negotiate and enter into reimbursement agreements when monies to construct project improvements are advanced;

8. Cause taxes, assessments, fees or charges to be levied as authorized by local, state, and federal law, and in a manner to accomplish the purposes of the Authority; and

9. Issue bonds.

This Amendment No. 1 may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which, when executed and delivered, shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which taken together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

12-1290 5B Page 3 of 4

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Members have entered into this Amendment effective on the date first above written.

COUNTY OF EL DORADO

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

Attest:

Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Capitol South East Connector Project

Financing Plan Chapter 5: Project financing and Revenues

Committed Funding \$ 118. Million

Sacramento Measure A funds: Sales tax funds allocated to the project on the 2004 ballot measure.

Anticipated Revenue \$ 360. Million (this cannot be used in El Dorado County)

 Federal and State Regional Funds: \$ 136.9 Million from annual apportionment to SACOG.

 Member Jurisdiction Development Impact Fees: \$197. Million to be collected from new

 development on a per unit basis by the member jurisdictions and applied to projects
 Public Comment

 identified in their respective CIPs.
 12-1290 5E

 Other Contributions: \$ 23.8 Million is anticipated to be collected by the member jurisdictions as a result of mitigation fees for either development projects or others.

Member Jurisdiction Direct Contributions: \$ 2.3 Million is expected to be made available directly from the member jurisdictions...could include possible in-kind, right-of-way,

utility relocation, and staffing.

Potential Revenue Sources \$ 80. Million

Supplemental Local Sales Tax: "Measure B" 1/2 cent sales tax to be tentatively planned for Sac.County voter approval in 2014.

State Vehicle Lic. Fee is a reinstatement of the original VLF fees.

Federal Stimulus Funds represents another round of federal stimulus to assist in economic recovery. Federal Transportation Grants will currently expire in 2014; perhaps a new bill will be developed. User Fees such as tolling or mileage-based revenue source will emerge as an alternative/substitute for the current gas tax. Other Misc. Revenues could materialize in a variety of forms or origins.

One more thing to consider. CARB readings. With all of the pollution and green house gas that will be coming with all of this, has anyone checked to see what the effect of these readings might be with more traffic being directed into El Dorado county from the Bay Area? They are taken by I.C.L.E.I.?

Please correct me if I do not have the appropriate understanding of this agreement with the JPA. Thank you for your time.

Vicki Clark

Public Comment 12-1290 5E