



**FOLSOM**  
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE

# Folsom City Council Meeting

## Additional Information Transmittal

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	6/10/2025
<b>AGENDA SECTION:</b>	New Business
<b>STAFF REPORT TITLE</b>	Resolution No. 11399- A Resolution Approving the Preliminary Engineer's Report for the Following Landscaping and Lighting Districts for Fiscal Year 2025-2026 and Setting Public Hearing for American River Canyon North, American River Canyon North No. 2, American River Canyon North No. 3, Blue Ravine Oaks, Blue Ravine Oaks No. 2, Briggs Ranch, Broadstone, Broadstone No. 4, Broadstone Unit No. 3, Cobble Ridge, Cobble Hills Ridge II/Reflections II, Folsom Heights, Folsom Heights No. 2, Hannaford Cross, Lake Natoma Shores, Los Cerros, Natoma Station, Natoma Valley, Prairie Oaks Ranch, Prairie Oaks Ranch No. 2, Prospect Ridge, Sierra Estates, Silverbrook, Steeplechase, The Residences at American River Canyon, The Residences at American River Canyon II, Willow Creek Estates East, Willow Creek Estates East No. 2, Willow Creek Estates South, and Willow Springs
<b>FROM:</b>	Parks and Recreation Department

Staff is providing the attached additional information for the above-referenced agenda item.

**Instructions to staff:** Deliver original and 30 stapled/double-sided copies to the City Clerk's Department; City Clerk's Department will distribute via email and hardcopy to City Council, City Manager, City Attorney, and City Clerk.

Updated: Jan 2025

**From:** William Barcellona <[wbarcellona@apg.org](mailto:wbarcellona@apg.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 9, 2025 1:15 PM

**To:** Bryan Whitemyer <[bwhitemyer@folsom.ca.us](mailto:bwhitemyer@folsom.ca.us)>; Sarah Aquino <[saquino@folsom.ca.us](mailto:saquino@folsom.ca.us)>; Steven Wang <[swang@folsom.ca.us](mailto:swang@folsom.ca.us)>

**Subject:** Natoma Station L&L District Matter on City Council Agenda

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [wbarcellona@apg.org](mailto:wbarcellona@apg.org). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon, all:

I wanted to provide some follow-up to my conversation with Bryan this past Friday afternoon concerning the pending Natoma Station L&L issue. I wanted to copy in Steve and Sarah on these points as well.

Rochelle and I supported the prior attempt to renew the L&L district and walked neighborhoods, speaking with several of our fellow Natoma Station residents. We will do so again if the Council agrees to move forward on a second vote effort.

I met with Bryan to discuss the basis of the push-back we are encountering. I agree with Bryan's position that the accrued deficits were spent on legitimate services within the L&L to the specific benefit of these residents. I also agree with the point that if the deficits are waived it would be to the prejudice of the broader Folsom community through an impact on the general fund. For me, the critical point is that Prairie Oaks committed to repay their deficit when they renewed their L&L district. If other districts have done the same, it is important to stress that precedent to the Natoma Station residents in future messaging efforts as soon as possible.

My remaining concerns are focused on how we move forward with a solution. My review of the proposition's provisions indicates that this formal process appears to have been lacking so far, which creates space for residents to threaten challenges to a repayment policy. I support the conclusion that formal action by the City Council is needed to comply with the underlying requirements of Proposition 218.

Additionally, opposition within Natoma Station is partially due to a lack of understanding that the city faces a significant negative budget impact related to the continued deficit accruals within the L&L districts. More than one neighbor has stated that they view the current attempt to force repayment of the deficit in the face of curtailed services as hostage taking. The residents need to know that there is a multiple L&L district problem with accruing deficits, not just within Natoma Station, and they need the facts about the cumulative impact on the city budget. It will help the Natoma Station residents to understand that the deficit gap can't be made up through the general fund for just our district. They need to hear this rationale from the city. It's not enough to state generally that mistakes were made in the past and that it's up to the Natoma Station residents to pay off the debt.

In addition to that point, a formal action by the City Council should, with respect, include the following points:

- In spite of the ten-year accrual of these deficits, no interest will be charged in the repayment process\*
- Repayment of all L&L deficits will be handled under the same policy across all L&L districts

- Repayment will be done in a manner that enables long-standing deferred maintenance issues to be funded with as much money as possible at the outset
- Repayment periods will be extended beyond 10 years to at least 15 years or longer, within the limits under Proposition 218, to facilitate the “front-loading” of deferred maintenance issues

I've discussed these points with a group of neighbors over the weekend and we seem to have a consensus that this structure can move us forward toward a solution. My question to Steve is whether an amended proposed resolution is then needed for consideration on Tuesday evening, and I know that we are past the Brown Act deadlines.

Your efforts to get our city finances in order is commendable. The points that I have outlined here will help create a sense of shared responsibility between the city and its residents so that we can move forward to preserve and advance Folsom's future.

Thanks for your consideration. I look forward to seeing you Tuesday evening.

All my best,

Bill Barcellona  
104 Hesler Court  
Folsom, CA  
(916) 606-6763  
[wbarcellona@apg.org](mailto:wbarcellona@apg.org)

\*I know that interest is not permitted under Proposition 218 without a prior action and approval from the district's property owners. Many neighbors seem to think the city is attempting to charge them interest on the deficit.