

## LATE DISTRIBUTION 7/17/18 #33

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

## BIA opposition letter to EDH CSD park fee increases

1 message

The BOSFOUR <br/>bosfour@edcgov.us> To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 16, 2018 at 6:39 PM

----- Forwarded message -----From: Jeff Short < Jeff@northstatebia.org>

Date: Mon, Jul 16, 2018 at 4:52 PM

Subject: BIA opposition letter to EDH CSD park fee increases

To: The BOSFOUR <boshour@edcgov.us>

Cc: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, BOS Two <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE

<br/><bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <br/>bosfive@edcgov.us>, Karen Feathers <karen.feathers@edcgov.us>, Donald

Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>

Good afternoon Chair Ranalli,

Attached, please find the BIA's letter of opposition to the El Dorado Hills Community Services District park fee increase on the agenda tomorrow.

Thank you,

Jeff Short

North State Building Industry Association

Legislative Advocate

D: 916-751-2758

C: 916-751-6690

jeff@northstatebia.org







July 16, 2018

Mr. Michael Ranalli Chair, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors 330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Chair Ranalli,

I am writing to express our continuing concerns about the legitimacy of the proposed El Dorado Hills Community Services District impact fee nexus study and the proposed fee increases. It is the position of the North State Building Industry Association that the Board of Supervisors should not approve any further fee adjustments until a diverse group of community interests can come together to look at the fee regime in El Dorado Hills holistically, keeping in mind our shared goal of building a community with an uncommonly high standard of living for all who reside there.

We first want to express our appreciation to the CSD for being so enthusiastic about accepting the direction of the Board of Supervisors to move the Very Low, Low, and Moderate income housing levels into the Multi-Family category, understanding that the sales price for these homes could be as high as \$390,000 according to the latest numbers provided by the state. However, these adjustments, which reduce the stream of revenues for park projects, were not reflected in the fee study's projected total amount collected. This calls into question the facilities the District hopes to build, which are predicated on a higher fee level.

As you know, we also have strong concerns about how much more new residents would pay for these community-wide facilities compared to existing residents, and about the much higher park construction costs in El Dorado Hills compared to the new portions of Folsom and Cameron Park. For instance, a Disc Golf Course is 40% higher in El Dorado Hills; a baseball field is at least 65% higher; and a "rectangular sports field" built by the El Dorado Hills Community Service District is slated to cost taxpayers sixteen times more than a "soccer field" in the Cameron Park CSD Parks and Recreation Master Plan which was adopted just four years ago. The regional building costs for parks simply do not support the fee levels proposed by the El Dorado Hills Parks District.

As a community, we have a common interest in developing a better mix of housing levels in the future. Unfortunately, the more fees are increased, the less economic incentive exists to build lower-income housing, even with incentives. This proposal, despite the changes, will not help

create affordable housing in El Dorado Hills and will not help the County reach its RHNA targets, especially after the TIM fee increase goes into effect next month.

While we are dissappointed that the above concerns have yet to be adequately addressed by the El Dorado Hills CSD, our main objection at this juncture would be to moving forward with any further fee changes before County staff can carry out the Board of Supervisors' May 22<sup>nd</sup> directive to convene a working group with all stakeholders. While we understand that County staff has begun planning these meetings, we have not yet had the opportunity to meet and look at the fees charged by the County, CSD, Fire Board, Water Board, and School Boards in El Dorado Hills in a truly collaborative and comprehensive way with all major interests to help ensure the the County is taking reasonable steps to meet its housing goals.

Our concern is that the significance of those talks could be undermined if districts can go outside of that process to adjust their fees. We worry that this large and diverse group of community interests will not be able to hit a moving target, and that districts will be loathe to return so soon to the Board of Supervisors to ask for further adjustments or adjustments in a different direction, even if that is the consensus of the working group.

In conclusion, we strongly encourage the Board of Supervisors to respect the community collaborative process that it has put in place before taking action on this or other fee adjustments that could affect the viability of housing projects in El Dorado County.

Sincerely,

**Chris Norem** 

Chin Room

Director of Governmental & Political Affairs North State Building Industry Association

Cc: El Dorado County Supervisors Hidahl, Frentzen, Veerkamp, Novasel El Dorado County Chief Administrative Officer Don Ashton