



FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS PROJECT FRONTIER FACT SHEET

Updated 4-19-23

General Overview

Project Frontier involves the development of a vacant parcel with two warehouse/distribution buildings (4,776,445 square feet total), several accessory buildings (6,949 square feet total) associated site improvements (parking, landscaping, etc.), and off-site improvements (Latrobe Road widening, signalization of Latrobe Road at Royal Oaks Drive). The proposed project would be constructed immediately south of the El Dorado Hills Business Park at Latrobe Rd. and Royal Oaks Dr. and is consistent with the current Research & Development (R&D) zoning which has existed since the 1980s.

The County remains in the process of reviewing the applicant's submitted materials.

Q 1: What is the project comprised of?

A: Building 1 (3,410,399 square feet) includes 56 loading docks and will accommodate 416 trailer parking stalls and 1,702 car parking stalls.

Building 2 (1,366,046 square feet) includes 119 loading docks and will accommodate 450 trailer stalls and 1,137 car parking stalls.

Nine Accessory Buildings (6,949 square feet) includes guard houses, pump houses and bike shelters

Q 2: How is a warehouse/distribution project considered compatible as R&D zoning rather than Heavy Industrial zoning?

A: The Matrix of Allowed Uses in Table 130.23.020 of the County Zoning Code, below, shows that the proposed use falls into the category "Wholesale Storage and Distribution". This is a permitted (P) use in all three industrial zones including R & D. Chapter 130.80 defines "Wholesale Storage and Distribution" as an establishment engaged in wholesaling, storage, warehousing, and bulk sale distribution. A local agency cannot selectively or arbitrarily require a discretionary approval for uses that the Zoning Code allows by right with a ministerial approval.

Table 130.23.020—Industrial/R&D Zones Use Matrix

EXPAND

IL: Industrial Low IH: Industrial High R&D: Research & Development	P	Allowed use (Article 4: Special Use Regulations)		
	A	Administrative permit required (130.52.010)		
	TUP	Temporary use permit required (130.52.060)		
	CUP	Conditional Use Permit required(130.52.021)		
	MUP	Minor use permit required (130.52.020)		
	TMA	Temporary mobile home permit (130.52.050)		
	—/b>	Use not allowed in zone		
	USE TYPE	IL	IH	R&D
Industrial				
Automotive and Equipment: Salvage and Wrecking Yard	CUP	CUP	—	
Hazardous Material Handling	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Industrial: General	P/CUP	P/CUP	CUP	
Specialized	CUP	CUP	—	

Laundries, Commercial	P	—	—	
Light Manufacturing	P	—	P	
Ceramic Products From Compounded Clay	P	—	P/CUP †	
Lightweight Nonferrous Metal Casting Foundry				
Mineral Exploration and Mining	See Table 130.29.070.1 (Mineral Exploration and Mining)			
Printing and Publishing	P	—	P	
Research and Laboratory Services	P	—	P	
Slaughterhouse	CUP	CUP	—	
Storage Yard: Equipment and Material	P	P	CUP	130.40.320.C
Permanent				
Temporary	TUP	TUP	TUP	
Wholesale Storage and Distribution	P	P	P	
Commercial				
Adult Business Establishment	A	—	—	130.40.040
Animal Sales and Service:				

Wholesale Storage and Distribution (Use Type). Establishments engaged in wholesaling, storage, warehousing, and bulk sale distribution. It does not include uses classified under "Equipment and Materials Storage Yard".

The only part of this project which is subject to discretionary approval is the application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to exceed the maximum height allowed in the R&D zone.

Section 130.30.060 *Height Limits and Exceptions* of the El Dorado County Zoning Code allows for additional height with approval of a CUP.

Q 3: What is the square footage of the various components of the project?

A: Project Frontier proposes two main buildings and several smaller accessory buildings.

The largest building (Building 1) is proposed at 103.5 feet tall. The footprint of this building is 650,639 square feet and the total square footage (within the five interior levels) is 3,410,399 square feet. Much of the square footage in this building is noted as “non-occupiable/unmanned,” meaning it is used for equipment only and not used by people. Of the 3,410,399 square feet of interior space, 1,215,795 square feet will be occupied warehouse and office space. 2,194,604 square feet will be non-occupiable/unmanned space.

Building 2 will be 54 feet tall. The footprint of this building is 1,085,621 square feet and the total square footage is 1,366,046 square feet, all of which can be occupied for warehouse and office space.

Nine accessory buildings such as guard houses, pump houses and bike shelters total 6,949 square feet. The total square footage of the project (both buildings including non-occupiable/unmanned space and accessory buildings) is 4,783,394 sf.

PROJECT FRONTIER - SQUARE FOOTAGES		
BUILDING 1		
FOOTPRINT	650,639	SF
GROUND LEVEL		
OFFICE	42,981	SF
WAREHOUSE	607,658	SF
MEZZANINE LEVEL		
WAREHOUSE	62,468	SF
NON-OCCUPIABLE/UNMANNED	287,824	SF
LEVEL 2		
WAREHOUSE	125,672	SF
NON-OCCUPIABLE/UNMANNED	476,695	SF
LEVEL 3		
WAREHOUSE	125,672	SF
NON-OCCUPIABLE/UNMANNED	476,695	SF
LEVEL 4		
WAREHOUSE	125,672	SF
NON-OCCUPIABLE/UNMANNED	476,695	SF
LEVEL 5		
WAREHOUSE	125,672	SF
NON-OCCUPIABLE/UNMANNED	476,695	SF
TOTAL WAREHOUSE/OFFICE	3,410,399	SF
PRIMARY GUARD HOUSE	278	SF
SECONDARY GUARD HOUSE	166	SF
PUMP HOUSE 1	1,276	SF
PUMP HOUSE 2	1,276	SF
LONG-TERM BIKE SHELTER	943	SF
TOTAL SQ FT	3,414,338	SF

BUILDING 2		
FOOTPRINT	1,085,621	SF
OFFICE	41,807	SF
WAREHOUSE	1,043,814	SF
MEZZANINE	280,425	SF
TOTAL WAREHOUSE/OFFICE	1,366,046	SF
PRIMARY GUARD HOUSE	278	SF
SECONDARY GUARD HOUSE	148	SF
PUMP HOUSE	1,641	SF
LONG-TERM BIKE SHELTER	943	SF
TOTAL SQ FT	1,369,056	SF
TOTAL PROJECT SQUARE FOOTAGE 4,783,394 SF		
(BOTH BUILDINGS AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS)		

Q 4: Why is Project Frontier requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)?

A: The applicant applied for a CUP to allow the two main buildings to exceed the current height limit of 50 feet. Building 1 is proposed at 103.5 feet and Building 2 is proposed at 54 feet.

Q 5: How is a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Processed?

A: A Conditional Use Permit requires a noticed public meeting.

Table 130.51.050.2 of the County Zoning Code shows that the Hearing Body for Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) is either the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission. *Whether the CUP is heard by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission is at the discretion of the Director of the Planning and Building Department. Regardless of the Hearing Body, the decision may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors.*

In both cases, the reviewing body considers the comprehensive project information in the staff report, along with any necessary studies, reports and public comment. The reviewing body's scope is limited to the discretionary request, in this case the CUP for height adjustments. The reviewing body will evaluate if the project meets applicable findings and any other requirements but cannot impose conditions that are not related to the discretionary request.

It is important to note that a design review permit for Project Frontier is not required. There are adopted [design standards for Research & Development](#) parcels. So long as the project complies with those standards, it is exempt from needing a Design Review permit consistent with Section 130.27.050(D)(1).

The applicant does have to address potential impacts to biological resources including wildlife and wildlife habitat, wetlands, waters of the U.S., Tribal cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, traffic, noise, and any other potential impact the project may cause.

The applicant has submitted biological and wetland assessments, noise and traffic studies, and all other assessments and/or studies required by Section 130.52.021 Conditional Use Permits and Chapter 130.50 Application Filing and Processing.

Although *no determinations have been made*, the applicant is requesting that the County review and consider an analysis of the proposed project under Section 15183 Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning of the 2023 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines. The document considers the proposed project's consistency with four previously certified Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) including the El Dorado Hills Business Park EIR (1982), the General Plan EIR (2004), the Targeted General Plan Amendment-Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPAZOU) EIR (2015), and the General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update (2017).

Q 6: When will the public hearing for the CUP be held?

A: The CUP process requires discretionary approval, including a public hearing, which *has not yet been scheduled*. The hearing will be noticed pursuant to Section 130.51.050.2 *Public Notice Requirements and Procedures* of the El Dorado Zoning Code and will include posting the notice to the County's website and social media platforms, placing a public notice in local newspapers and mailing a notice to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the project parcel.

Q 7: What will comprise the CUP Hearing Body? (updated 4/19/23)

A: The Hearing Body for Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) is either the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, at the discretion of the Director of the Planning and Building Department. Tables 130.51.050.2 and 130.50.030.A of the County Zoning Code note that either the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission decide Conditional Use Permits. Table 130.50.030.A further notes that "Where two deciding review authorities are indicated, such as for Conditional Use Permits, the review authority of original jurisdiction will be determined by the complexity of the project."

On April 19, 2023, the Director of Planning and Building made the [determination](#) that the project will be heard by the Planning Commission.

While the Planning Commission will have review authority of original jurisdiction, its decision is appealable to your Board, in compliance with Section 130.52.90 (Appeals).

Q 8: What environmental review and or approvals were considered for this project?

A: The site was rezoned in the early 1980s from Exclusive Agriculture to Research and Development to create an “industrial business park.” The rezone was analyzed in the 1982 El Dorado Hills Business Park Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 1982070503). *The project site has thus had R&D zoning since the early 1980s and “Wholesale Storage and Distribution” is an allowed use in the R&D Zone.*

With the certification of the El Dorado Hills Business Park Environmental Impact Report, the EDH Business Park was approved and anticipated to build out over time. The County thus assumed development on the project site with zoning-consistent uses and analyzed it that way when adopting the 2004 General Plan, which was analyzed in the 2003 El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (“General Plan EIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2001082030).

Buildout of the project parcel was also assumed and analyzed in the subsequent amendments to the 2004 General Plan, including:

- 2015 El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report (“TGPA-ZOU EIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2012052074); and

- 2017 Biological Resources Policy Update and Oak Resources Management Plan Environmental Impact Report (“Biological Resources EIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2012052074).

Development of the EDH Business Park, including this project site, was assumed in those EIRs, and the proposed project is consistent with the zoning, General Plan policies, and analyses in those EIRs.

Q 9: Have there been significant environmental changes since the environmental review(s) completed in 1980, 2004, or 2015?

A: An environmental consultant is currently preparing a comprehensive CEQA consistency analysis under Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 and, alternatively section 15168, that examines the prior environmental review with which the project is consistent and ensures that there is no substantial new information that was not known when the prior environmental documents were certified. The consistency analysis is currently being finalized and the County will independently review the consistency analysis to make its independent determination. The consistency analysis will also be available to the public.

The consistency analysis considers and relies on numerous project-specific studies that consider current conditions to ensure there is no new information that was not known when the prior EIRs were certified.

The Project Frontier Biological Resources Technical Report (“Biological Report”) reflects the current regulatory and ecological settings of the project site and the environmental consultant has determined there are no new impact types from those considered in the General Plan EIR, TGPA-ZOU EIR, and Biological Resources EIR. The Biological Report includes minor variations in biological resources covered that stem from special-status species regulatory status changes and/or differences in potential for occurrence (based on site-specific habitat features and cumulatively current occurrence records), but these changes from the prior EIRs are not new or substantive. Further, the Biological Report identifies universally applied development standards and mitigation adopted in the prior EIRs. It is anticipated that the project will be required to comply with these universally applied development standards and mitigation adopted in the prior EIRs.

Q 10: What is the anticipated traffic impact of Project Frontier?

A: The traffic report is awaiting finalization by the County Department of Transportation. However, the following Transportation Impact Analysis Report has been prepared by the applicant and is currently *being independently peer reviewed by the County.*

- Daily truck trips are 1,250.
- Project trucks would generally enter from the first signalized intersection at Royal Oaks Drive and exit from the fourth access at the southern corner that would also be signalized.
- The Report estimates 3,808 daily passenger trips, which would be the employee trips.
- The Report estimates the project will generate approximately 80% less daily trips than assumed and analyzed for the parcel in the General Plan EIR. Specifically, the Transportation Impact Analysis Report identifies 5,058 daily auto and truck trips compared to the anticipated and analyzed 23,540 daily trips in the General Plan EIR at buildout.
- The Report shows that project traffic on Latrobe Road would cause the roadway segment Level of Service (“LOS”) to change from D to a high E (volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.99) between Golden Foothill Parkway (S) and Golden Foothill Parkway (N). This operation is considered acceptable.
- Further, the Report indicates the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange ramp-terminal intersections would operate acceptably at LOS B under existing condition with the addition of the proposed project during both the AM and PM peak hours. About 15 percent of the project’s truck trip generation (i.e., about 7 truck trips in the PM peak hour) were estimated to have an origin/destination on US 50 to/from the east. Consequently, the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange would have adequate capacity to accommodate additional project traffic without resulting in unacceptable traffic operations.
- In addition, Phase 2B of the US 50/Latrobe Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange Improvements project (Adopted 2022 Capital Improvement Program, Project Number 36104001) will result in acceptable operations at the interchange and at the Latrobe Road/White Rock Road intersection (see Table 10 for details). The CIP identifies construction of Project Number 36104001 beginning in 2026/2027. Therefore, further deterioration would be a short-term condition.

For trucks, accessing US 50 from Latrobe Road has the following advantages as compared to access from White Rock Road/Silva Valley Parkway:

- Slip On-Ramp – The eastbound on-ramp from Latrobe Road is a slip ramp, which allows for better acceleration compared to the loop on-ramp at the Silva Valley Interchange.
- Acceleration Lane – The eastbound on-ramp from Latrobe Road enters an auxiliary lane that connects to the eastbound off-ramp at the Silva Valley Interchange. The auxiliary lane functions as an acceleration lane (especially for trucks).
- Freeway Grade – The grade of eastbound US 50 at Latrobe Road is less than the grade at White Rock Road/Silva Valley Parkway, which is at the toe of the Bass Lake Grade. Less grade improves truck acceleration.

As noted above, the report is currently under independent peer review by the County and will be posted to the County’s website once finalized.

Q 11: Has any analysis been provided regarding the impact of the planned US50 Empire Ranch Road interchange in Folsom, which will terminate at White Rock Road in Sacramento County, just adjacent to Carson Crossing in El Dorado County?

A: The applicant’s Transportation Impact Analysis Report – *which is currently under independent peer review by the County* – shows that roadway segments and study intersections on White Rock Road (at Carson Crossing Road and at Windfield Way/Town Center Boulevard) would operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours under existing plus project conditions, indicating there will be reserve capacity at these study facilities. While the US 50/Empire Ranch Road interchange would provide an alternative for project vehicles traveling to/from the west on US 50, the shift in project traffic to that interchange would be small because the US 50/Latrobe Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange would remain the most direct route for project trips.

The traffic impacts were analyzed for traffic operations under existing plus project conditions and evaluated the proposed project’s consistency with the General Plan’s Year 2025 and buildout (i.e., beyond 2025) scenarios (see pp. 46-48). The project is found to generate fewer daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips compared to the site trip generation analyzed for both the General Plan scenarios.

Q 12: Why isn’t analysis being done to ensure the project is compliant with current CEQA requirements rather than those from 40 years ago?

A: The project does not rely primarily or exclusively on the environmental analysis from the EDH Business Park EIR. The CEQA consistency analysis, which the applicant is finalizing, relies on more recent environmental review with the General Plan EIR, TGPA-ZOU EIR, and Biological Resources EIR. Once submitted, staff will review the document against State and local requirements and policies.

Q 13: What analysis has been done to ensure the project would comply with County noise ordinances to protect residents, businesses and schools?

A: The Acoustical Analyses - Sound Study (“Acoustical Analyses”) was used to predict noise impact. The study used the three-dimension acoustical modeling software to predict a worst-case scenario at nearby sensitive receptors. The Acoustical Analyses concluded that the maximum, worst-case sound emissions at nearby sensitive receptors would comply with the County standards.

Q 14: How will economic benefits of this project be distributed in the County?

A: The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors is responsible for determining the distribution of property and sales tax revenue from the project that are discretionary within the County’s General Fund.

Q 15: Have any incentives or fee deferrals been requested or approved for this project?

A: No incentives or fee deferrals have been requested or approved for this project.

Q 16: Why were incentives and deferrals indicated in a 2017 letter to attract Amazon to this site?

A: This was done in response to a request from the Greater Sacramento Economic Council to identify any suitable sites that would meet a Request for Qualifications that Amazon issued nationally to select its second Headquarters site. All major competitors included tax breaks, incentives and fee deferrals. *Project Frontier is **not** related to that 2017 project nor was it anticipated at that time.*

Q 17: What is the development history with this site?

A: DST Systems owned the parcel in question and sold it to a residential homebuilder Tom Winn Communities, aka Winncrest in 2017.

In 2019, the Board of Supervisors received a presentation by Winn Communities that proposed a residential community of 700 to 900 homes, open space and park land. The project required a General

Plan Amendment, a rezone to the Specific Plan and Adoption of an amended Specific Plan. Winn Communities later announced it had de-annexed the same property from the El Dorado Hills Business Park. This project concept was never finalized or brought forward to a public hearing. Therefore, the zoning and land use remained R & D.

In 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved consent calendar item to explore the potential for economic development anywhere within El Dorado County. Former CAO Don Ashton entered into a non-disclosure agreement with Dermody Properties regarding the disclosure of Dermody's client.

In January 2023, Dermody Properties filed an application with the County to build Project Frontier for a yet-to-be-disclosed client. Winn Communities still owns the property.

Once Dermody submits for formal building permits the tenant may be revealed.

Q 18: What is the purpose of the signed Nondisclosure Agreement?

A: In 2021, the Board of Supervisors authorized the Chief Administrative Officer to sign a Nondisclosure Agreement (NDA) on behalf of El Dorado County with Dermody Properties to allow for discussions between Dermody and County staff regarding potential commercial real estate development in the County.

The purpose of the NDA was to allow Dermody Properties to share information with the County with respect to their evaluation of various sites for operations and businesses in El Dorado County, as well as information relative to Dermody's or its clients' operations and businesses. The NDA applies to non-public information disclosed by Dermody to the County that is designated by Dermody as confidential information prior to its disclosure, such as the identify of Dermody's client for Project Frontier.

The NDA does not prohibit the disclosure of public project information that is submitted to the County to facilitate the County's evaluation of the Project's compliance with applicable laws, standards, and policies.

Next Steps

Staff is currently reviewing the submitted materials and will schedule a public hearing, pursuant to the above-mentioned Zoning Code requirements once that review has been completed. ***The public hearing on the CUP has NOT yet been scheduled.***

Last Updated: April 12, 2023