

CONSUMNES COMMUNITY PLANNING  
ADVISORY COUNCIL (CCPAC) MEETING MINUTES  
(November 13, 2013 meeting minutes which were approved on December 11,  
2013)

**OFFICERS:**            FREDERICK HEGGE            CHAIR  
                              JAMES PERHAM                VICE-CHAIR  
                              TRICIA LOPEZ                 SECRETARY

**MEMBERS:**            ROBERT HUNTER                EVAN K. WINN  
                              DANIEL REID                    JON OLDENBURG  
                              JAMES MOORE

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

All members are present.

**PLANNING ITEMS FOR REVIEW:**

1. **Control No.:** PLNP2013-00122            CONTINUED ITEM FROM OCTOBER 23, 2013

**Assessor's Parcel No.:**    **Various**

Applicant:                    County of Sacramento and the Capitol Southeast  
   Connector JPA

**Project Name:**                **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE  
CAPITAL SOUTHEAST CONNECTOR**

County Project  
Manager:                        Mike Winter, Senior Planner, (916) 874-6141,  
[winter@saccounty.net](mailto:winter@saccounty.net)

**Project Description:**        The Capital Southeast Connector project (Connector) is a  
proposal to build a 35-mile long multi-modal transportation  
facility that will extend from the I-5/Hood-Franklin Road  
interchange, northeast to Highway 50 near El Dorado Hills.  
The related General Plan Amendments will include  
amending the Circulation Element to define the function and  
components of the Connector, and amending the Circulation

Element Transportation Plan to show the Connector's general alignment.

**Motions:**

Motion 1:

James Moore moved and Evan Winn seconds the motion to approve the amendment to the general plan.

Motion: To approve the amendment as stated in the agenda.

The motion was denied as the vote was 5 against and 2 in favor of the motion.

Motion 2:

Daniel Reid moved and James Perham seconds the motion to table further motions and clarify minutes based on lack of documents and information that could materially alter the project as well as express other concerns associated with the project that could fundamentally alter the character and integral historic usage of Grant Line Road based on the information provided to date.

The motion was approved with a vote of 5 in favor and 2 that were against the motion.

Note: Several motions were made to deny the general plan amendment that were approved but later retracted by the board to ensure the board's concerns regarding the project as well as the desire to see Grant Line Road improved were fully expressed.

**CCPAC Concerns and explanation for Voting against the General Plan**

**Amendment:**

- Consider self-mitigation within the buffer.
- Consider the farmers using these roadways and the impact it will have on their ability to move large equipment in a safe manner. The section between Sheldon and Keifer is a particular concern. Increasing intersections may help address the impact on farming. Consider curb cuts in media for farm equipment. Consider a frontage road.
- Consider re-circulating EIR with settlement agreement as the impact of the settlement agreement wasn't considered in the original EIR.

- The amendment to the general plan does not appear to be necessary for the improvement of Grant Line Road. Further conflicting information was presented regarding the necessity of a general plan amendment, the document from JPA and county said it was necessary and a follow up document from JPA sent before the 12/11 meeting said it was not.
- The project should include a stoplight at Sloughhouse Road because of the horse facility and the danger trailers entering traffic could create.
- More detail on the road itself would help with a better understanding of the project and increase transparency.
- The use of the word corridor allows an expansive definition that may carry additional allowances and create unknown/unforeseen issues.
- The General Plan Amendment language does not contain the clarity to show why it is necessary to the project as it is being described.
- How does the project contemplate obtaining water for irrigation?
- CCPAC would prefer smaller focus groups addressing sections or segments of the roadway to account for very specific needs along the roadway.
- Why is it that the general plan amendment is required in such a short time period when the project is not starting for a number of years.
- Despite objections and skepticism from the board regarding the general plan amendment, it should not be interpreted as one that is completely against the development of Grant Line Road. The board would like to see Grant Line Road improved in a manner that is consistent with the community needs and values – most importantly, the rural lifestyle supporting farming and agriculture.
- The CCPAC would like to note that in seeking advice from County Counsel and requesting that communication would remain privileged, the subsequent email was dispersed in a clear violation of the privilege. Rather than preserve the candor and privilege that was anticipated the questions were distributed to the applicant to who jointly answered the questions. These responses have proven to be misleading i.e. the response to the necessity of a general plan amendment.

- CCPAC includes in the motion the preservation of an automatic appeal should the County vote contrary to the CCPAC's vote.
- Documents that are specifically cited in the settlement agreement between ECOS and JPA have not been provided. These documents are critical in understanding the project. The documents include the memorandum of understanding between the JPA and SACOG and the JPA report prioritizing land acquisitions on the South and East side of the connector.
- Given past experiences with applicants who have come through the CCPAC process it appears that this project may be premature as many of the basic documents and details appear to be incomplete and/or not ready for circulation.
- Further assurances that the local agricultural community's interests will be heavily considered in the project.