



EL DORADO COUNTY/CITY OF FOLSOM  
SPECIAL JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY MEETING  
MINUTES



Wednesday July 16, 2008  
9:00 a.m.

Folsom City Council Chambers  
50 Natoma Street  
Folsom, CA 95630

- 
- I. Call to Order: Chair Morin called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.
  - II. Pledge of Allegiance
  - III. Roll Call  
Present: Chair Morin, Vice Chair Dupray, Director Milkos, Director Baumann
  - IV. Introduction of Guests

David Storer, representing El Dorado County, introduced Gayle Erbe-Hamlin, Interim CAO of El Dorado County.

- V. Approval of Minutes: March 31, 2008 - Moved by Director Miklos and seconded by Director Baumann. Unanimously approved.

- VI. New Business

- A. Sacramento East Area Aggregate Mining Project Applications

Planning Manager Gail Furness de Pardo introduced Cindy Storelli from the County of Sacramento. Ms. Storelli stated that she was present on behalf of Robert Sherry, Sacramento County Planning Director. She distributed handouts to the Directors, one of which was from a tour that was done with the county executive team in May – it covers the entire eastern part of the county and talks about the Jackson Corridor Visioning Area, the Keifer Land Fill, Grant Line East Visioning Area, and the three east county mining proposals. She also handed out a brief summary of the three applications that are underway, along with a comparison table of the three. She introduced Heidi Tschudin, who was hired to process the three applications. The Teichert Quarry EIR is expected to come out sometime this summer (August). A group has been pulled together called the East County Coordination Group to review these projects – it's an open process; however, they haven't met in the last few months because they were meeting individually with the different quarry applicants. El Dorado County could be included in the group if they so desired.

Director Morin asked what the membership of the East County Coordination Group was.

Ms. Storelli replied that it was mostly staff - it isn't anticipated at this point that it include City Council members or Board of Supervisors. It is made up of representatives from the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento and many different staff members from these two agencies, including the Department of Transportation, Environmental Review, Planning, Economic Development, etc.

Chair Morin requested that Planning Manager de Pardo follow up with El Dorado County to see if they have the desire to be included in the East County Coordination Group.

Director Baumann agreed that it would be a good idea to invite staff from El Dorado County because of the traffic and visual impacts.

Heidi Tschudin stated that she was a contract land use planner working with Sacramento County on this project. The type of quarrying that is being examined in this area by the three applicants is hard rock quarrying, which is a little different from mining of tailings. Some of the characteristics of hard rock mining are that you mine in a smaller area but typically mine much deeper. It uses blasting to loosen the hard rock and also to break down the material (quartz, diorite, slate). The types of products from this type of mining include asphalt, concrete, riprap, ballast, and aggregate base. One of the applicants is also requesting the ability to do concrete manufacturing products. A portable processing plant will be established that they will use until they reach shallow depths of 40-70 feet.

The three applicants are from Teichert, Granite, DeSilva Gates. The staff report includes a summary of each application, including site plans. Ms. Tschudin gave a comparison of the three applications. The Teichert Quarry includes 380 acres of mining and processing area of the 583-acre site; the Walltown Quarry includes 613 acres of mining and processing area of the 1,360-acre site; and the Barton Quarry includes 260 acres for the mining and processing area of the 480-acre site. The total mining and processing area for the three facilities, if approved as proposed, would be 1,253 acres. The permit duration of the Teichert application would be for a 25-year permit and the DeSilva Gates and Granite applications are for a 100-year permit. The total mining tonnage that is proposed for Teichert is 135 million tons over the 25-year period; the Walltown Quarry (Granite facility) is proposing 350 million tons over the 100-year period; and the Barton Quarry (DeSilva Gates) is proposing 300 million tons over the 100-year period. The total tonnage over the various periods would be 788 million tons.

In terms of annual productions, all three applicants have established maximums, which will be used for the purpose of the environmental reviews. The Teichert Quarry proposes 7 million tons per year (they may do less but couldn't exceed that if granted their permit). The Walltown and Barton Quarry have proposed a maximum of 6 million tons per year. The Teichert Quarry proposes to mine to a maximum depth of 200 feet; the Walltown Quarry proposes to mine to a maximum of 400 feet; and the DeSilva Quarry proposes a maximum depth of 300 feet. All applicants are proposing portable plants until they reach a certain depth and then would bring in permanent plants that would be on site for the life of the project. The Teichert project proposes to have a conveyor system that would convey approximately 40% of their material over to their existing Grant Line facility. That facility has recycling, asphalt, and concrete plants so they are not proposing any new facilities as part of their application. De Silva Gates project is proposing an asphalt, concrete, and recycling facility. Granite is proposing the same, but in addition they are proposing concrete and stone manufacturing plants.

In terms of the order the quarries are being processed, Teichert will be the first to be considered - they were the first one to apply (2002). Their EIR has been in production in the County process and is due to be released within the next few weeks (end of July or August). The Granite application is next in line - it was submitted in 2005. The EIR is underway, but the actual date for release is unclear at this time. The DeSilva application was submitted in 2006; it is currently on hold in the County's environmental process for additional information so its EIR has not been started yet. All three applications have had Notices of Preparation released and various agencies and entities have commented.

Chair Morin open the discussion for public comment; no one came forward to speak.

Chair Morin noted that the City Council would try to schedule this project as an informational item at a future meeting to get the public up to date. There are concerns about traffic, air quality issues, etc.

Director Miklos stated the he and Council Member Starsky, as part of the Subcommittee for the SOI, are absolutely opposed to having any truck traffic bifurcating the Sphere of Influence Annexation area. At looking the proposed routes, he questioned why these routes pass Prairie City to go to Scott Road.

Ms. Storelli explained that the map actually shows the route of the tour not the truck routes. In response to Chair Morin, she reiterated that the Teichert EIR was scheduled to be release in early August.

Director Miklos stated that what needed to be a perpetual condition of approval is some type of funding mechanism to maintain the roads. Millions of dollars are being spent for a new roadway between Highway 99 and El Dorado County.

Ms. Storelli replied that the Board of Supervisors shared that concern.

**B. Lightrail Station Parking and Update**

Tom Garcia, Public Works Department, gave a brief update on the parking situation of light rail, stating that light rail has experienced up to a 40% increase in ridership, with Goldline feeling the impacts. Folsom Stageline has seen an increase in ridership as well. The park-and-ride lots are showing the impact of that increased ridership. The Iron Point station has two park-and-ride lots and the overflow on the south lot was pretty much full all day; the Glenn station is also full all day long. The City has increased on street parking to provide a little relief. The Historic District station is also full and was the station of choice for the riders. The City is working with the merchants to develop a parking plan for possible increased use of the parking structure for the short term or until the parking structure is utilized by businesses of the Railroad Block. RT is working at increasing signage to the Hazel station that was underutilized.

Chair Morin reiterated that on-street parking has been added and implemented at the Glenn Station.

Mark Rackovan, Public Works Department, replied that they moved some parking signs around on Coolidge Drive to create an addition 10± spaces in the vicinity of the Glenn Drive Station. On the topic of the parking structure, staff has been working with the merchants association, as well as the Chamber of Commerce to develop a plan that will continue to meet the needs of the employees, shoppers, visitors, and still provide a little capacity for light rail users. The original intent of the parking structure was to meet the future needs for the Folsom Station Project and revitalize the Historic District. The decision was made to not allow light rail users, but as gas prices have increased, staff is rethinking that decision. Staff will create some permit passes that will be made available to approximately 100 light rail riders. The plan is that preference would be given first to Folsom residents – staff is negotiating what the rate would be, but would be made available on a quarterly basis. Staff is hoping to implement this plan in September at the latest.

In response to Chair Morin, Mr. Rackovan replied that staff had a conference call with the City Manager and Mayor King and it was agreed that a memo would be provided to the City Council. It would not go before the City Council as an agenda item.

Director Miklos referenced a previous discussion about expanding the dirt area at the Iron Point Station – is staff still looking at into doing that.

Mr. Garcia, Public Works Department, replied that there was a possibility of getting some regional funding to expand that site. Staff is working with SACOG to transfer some funding from other light rail stations to increase parking at the Iron Point Station.

Director Miklos stated that he understood that El Dorado County was using buses to shuttle some of their residents to light rail in Folsom. He further commented that he has heard from a lot residents that they would be happy to ride the bus to come to Folsom to ride light rail rather than trying to find a place to park. He requested that the Chair send a letter to Placer County to see about the possibility of them using a shuttle for their residents as well.

Chair Morin requested that Planning Manager dePardo to draft a letter to Placer County regarding Director Miklos' request.

**VII. Unfinished Business**

**A. Status of Regionally Important Transportation Improvement Projects**

**1. City of Folsom**

Mr. Garcia, Public Works Department, gave an update on the progress of the bridge construction. The decks are being poured in segments and its schedule for opening is now spring 2009. Other projects that the City is doing as part of the bridge project include the East Natoma widening, and staff is working with the Bureau on widening Green Valley Road to four lanes up to the County line. The City and County are also part of the connector project. The EIR for the connector road RFP has gone out and staff has received three proposals. Staff hopes to award the environmental contract in August.

## 2. El Dorado County

### B. Existing EDC/Folsom JPA Account

Larry Appel, El Dorado County, stated that the \$2,000 balance in the account was set aside for El Dorado County; he didn't know that it was considered a joint JPA funding source. Director Baumann asked that a budget be put together. Staff will continue to provide staff support for their side of the JPA and if there is a need for a special study/report, it will be brought back to the JPA to decide to how to split the cost. He didn't see a need for an actual budget because there have not been any expenses. He suggested that the funds remain where it was – it was required to be in place at the time the JPA was set up.

Chair Morin agreed that things should be left the way they were.

Director Baumann noted that the by-laws were the issue. According to the by-laws they have to adopt and approve a budget annually. They need to change the by-laws and strike that language.

Mr. Appel suggested that they could adopt the \$2,000 budget per year and roll it over each year.

Chair Morin stated that the easiest thing to do would be to adopt a budget that has zero revenue and zero expenditures.

### C. Existing EDC/Folsom JPA Account/ JPA Amendment/By-laws Discussion

This item was included in the above discussion. Director Baumann suggested that the budget be approved at the first of the year.

### D. Status of the Highway 50 Corridor Mobility Partnership Program

Richard Lorenz, Public Works Director, stated that the partnership has been in existence for a few years now and the goal of the partnership is to work regionally toward delivering some key transportation projects. He recognized some of the private partners in the audience: Russ Davis of Elliott Homes, and Nick Alexander. His goal is to seek the JPA's support and endorsement for a regional fee that will be presented to the various member agency boards.

Gene Endicott gave a brief presentation, stating that they wanted to focus on the key element of the funding plan for the program. A PowerPoint presentation was shared with the Directors.

The Highway 50 Corridor Mobility Partnership was formed approximately three years ago to collaboratively and proactively address transportation challenges in the Highway 50 Corridor and to identify specific projects that would reduce congestion and improve mobility for area residents and workers. The Partnership includes four jurisdictions and private landowners (GenCorp, Elliott Homes, AKT Development, Carpenter Ranch) and coordinating agencies (Caltrans, SACOG, and Sacramento Regional Transit). Another objective is to expedite delivery of those key transportation projects and to pursue funding opportunities that reward regional transportation planning and to leverage private funding.

It has always been assumed by this partnership that some level of private investment would be required in order to move recommended projects forward. Priority near-term improvements include a couple of transit-related improvements that were approved by the Partnership and several road

improvements. These projects collectively are estimated to produce a reduction in vehicle hours of delay of approximately 30% on Highway 50 and through the corridor when they are implemented.

The fundamental goal in identifying the projects that would provide the best benefit in this area was to provide parallel capacity to Highway 50 and provide realistic options for people that travel primarily east/west through that area without necessarily being on Highway 50. A graphic of the proposed projects were shared with the Directors.

The regional fee program is an element of the overall funding strategy to implement some of these proposed projects. The Partnership had to decide which near-term, priority projects would be in the regional fee program. He identified four projects (Auxiliary lanes on Highway 50; the White Rock Road improvements, the improvements that would create a connection between Hazel and White Rock Road; and increasing the frequency of service of the light rail line east of Sunrise to Folsom from every 30 minutes of every 15 minutes). These projects were identified primarily because of their regional nature and usage by residents in all four-partnership jurisdictions and their impact on congestion throughout the corridor.

In terms of the implementation, these projects have an estimated total cost of \$424 million. The fee program would be expected to generate approximately \$169 million (40% of total). It is also expected that implementation of the fee program would help to leverage required additional public funding, regional, state and federal funding. The implementation would be based on a district approach, but the fees are differentiated by district based on the type of development and its location, which in turn is based on the relative impact on the corridor transportation system.

The governance structure is still being worked on and would be determined and implemented prior to any fees actually being collected. A map of how the fee districts are currently identified and a pie chart outlining the revenue generated if the fee was approved was shared with the Directors. It is anticipated that the fee would be implemented both on commercial and residential development in each of the districts. There is a net cost per D.U.E. based on overlap of this program with other existing local fee programs.

Director Baumann asked for clarification with regard to overlapping of fees.

Mr. Lorenz, Public Works Department, replied that it would be a little different in each agency. He gave an example of the Folsom SOI, stating staff anticipates that as the SOI capital improvement and fee program is developed that some component of the projects that are in the regional fee would also have been in that program. Staff is estimating approximately \$1,800 per unit for the SOI.

Russ Nygaard, EDC Dept. of Transportation, stated the total contribution for El Dorado County would be approximately \$37 million. But if you look at the near-terms projects listed in their area, the only project was the White Rock Road project. They currently have \$26 million in their fee program for improvements for White Rock Road which match what the Partnership wants to do in order to get the traffic flowing through that region. The \$26 million is subtracted from the \$37 million for \$11 million that it's hoped that they will be able to contribute in order to make up the difference. They do not anticipate an increase to their development fees. They anticipate using additional "other agency" money in order to offset that \$11 million.

Mr. Lorenz stated that for the Folsom SOI, staff has not developed a capital improvement or fee program. It is hopeful that the regional fee is adopted and will be easy for staff to count on that as work continues for the Folsom SOI. The Folsom share to the regional fee would be approximately \$39 million and would be applied to that undeveloped property south of Highway 50. The gross fee would be about \$4,500 per unit, with the net fee being \$2,600 per unit. The first step would be to go to each member agency council/board with a resolution of intention to adopt the fee. The El Dorado County Board is expected to hear this item on July 29, Rancho Cordova on August 4<sup>th</sup> and Folsom City Council on August 26. In the case of Sacramento County, they are scheduling their resolution after an update to their existing traffic impact fee (later this summer). Staff wants to get the JPA's support for the effort of the 50 Corridor Mobility Partnership to move forward with the regional fee.

Director Miklos commented that he needed more information before moving forward. He voiced concern about having so many fees in the SOI area that it would prohibit development. He requested an individual briefing on this before August 26 and if possible, before their SOI meeting which is the first Wednesday in August.

Director Dupray noted that it was their intention to adopt the fee, but felt it would be contingent on everyone else adopting the fee. He asked what would happen if all seven districts didn't buy in.

Mr. Lorenz, Public Works Department, replied if they didn't get buy-in from all the agencies, they won't have a completely funded program and would have to revisit the list of projects. The value in going forward with the resolution of intention is that it allows staff to find out if all four of the member agencies are on board. He clarified that there were seven zones, but only four agencies.

Director Miklos noted that the Aerojet property is not currently intended for development. He asked what was the long-term plan for when it does fold into the development projects.

Mr. Lorenz replied that it was GenCorp's desire to not include that property at this point because they thought development was so far out. They recognize that if development occurs in that area, they will need to be brought in.

Martha Lofgren added that Aerojet absolutely understands that they would be part of the regional fee. The reason the area is crosshatched on the exhibit is because part of land includes their current building and they were concerned that their employees would see it and think they would lose their jobs. As they come forward to the different public agencies, they were very sensitive to issues in each jurisdiction, particularly El Dorado County. There are legal steps that have to be completed so currently it wasn't the actual implementation of the fee. There has to be a nexus study before any of the agencies to take action. She added that they have a strong level of support from the private development community because they are working to leverage state and federal dollars. They have a very unusual situation with Will Kempton as the Caltrans Director – he was certainly helpful in getting the CIMA funding both for El Dorado County and the White Rock Road project. They want to take advantage of Mr. Kempton's presence and knowledge of their area. He has come out on multiple times in support of the regional fee concept. They also learned recently that some of the jurisdictions along the Interstate 5 corridor are copying their efforts and are trying to do something similar. Now they have competition, so they feel it's important to get the project done, and if they are going to have a regional fee, they have reach the finish line. They are setting a goal for the end of the year.

Chair Morin stated that based on the timeframe Mr. Lorenz discussed, he asked they meet the end of the year goal to implement the fee schedule

#### VIII. Public Comments

Chair Morin asked if there were any comments on items not on the agenda.

Bill Bryant shared comments from a previous meeting of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors regarding Mather. He assured them that they were not "throwing them under the bus" regarding the settlement agreement with Mather. The Board directed staff to be ready to respond to the Mather EIR when it was released.

Chuck Coalson shared his observations with the JPA with regard to cargo carriers that fly into Mather.

#### IX. Communications

None

X. Next Meeting:

A. Next Meeting –

It was decided that the next JPA meeting would be held at the chambers in El Dorado County on October 1<sup>st</sup>.

B. Items for Next Agenda:

XI. Miscellaneous

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.