



## LATE DISTRIBUTION 3-11-14

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

### Comment on 3-11-14 BOS Agenda Items #7, General Plan Amendment for Oak Woodlands Policies

2 messages

sue-taylor@comcast.net <sue-taylor@comcast.net>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:09 PM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, BOSDistr1 <bosone@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors,

Last week at the 3-4-14 Board of Supervisors Meeting it came to the attention of several of us that you were about to approve the following on Consent Calendar, item #6 without a scope of work:

- 1) *Make findings pursuant to Section 3.13.03 of the County Ordinance that it is more economical and feasible to engage an independent contractor to prepare policy analysis and an Environmental Impact Report for a General Plan Amendment to review several General Plan polices related to biological resources; and*
- 2) *Approve and authorize the Chair to sign Agreement 425-S1411 with Dudek in the amount of \$377,100 for a term of three years to proceed with a program to **amend several General Plan related to biological resources.** (Cont: 3/4/14, Item 6)*

Due to the lack of a scope of work the item was pulled. A discussion proceeded as to what was being approved. One Supervisor stated that this item is to just analyze and give direction, yet the item states that the Board is planning to amend six Oak Woodland policies within the General Plan. Another Board member stated looking at the item, as written, would give the public cause for concern, yet the item's description has not been changed.

I would ask that the Board remove this item from consent calendar in order to give the public more clarity to the desired direction of this Board in regards to the future of our Oak Woodlands. The last time this item was addressed was on 9-24-12. In trying to watch the video 2 sections were blocked out during the discussion causing it to be difficult to understand the intent of the Board at that time.

Many policies were put into the General Plan in order to protect the county's resources. It seems that implementing many of these protections has not been a priority with past Boards. Is it the intent of the current Board to continue in the same direction?

This EIR will facilitate the ability for developers to proceed with the destruction of our historic Oaks.

Please pull this item and explain your reasoning in spending over \$377,100 in public funds for this endeavor.



Thank you,  
Sue Taylor

Please attach this email to the item.

---

**Monique Wilber** <monique.w@comcast.net>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 6:34 AM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bostthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, BOSDistr1 <bosone@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors;

I am the former project manager and Senior Planner on the Oak Woodlands Management Plan.

This item, 3/11/14 BOS Agenda Item #7, General Plan Amendment for Oak Woodlands Policies, needs to be pulled from the Consent Calender for public discussion, and needs to be properly agendized and noticed prior to discussion. Given the history of lawsuits and the Writ of Mandate surrounding oak woodlands (due to previous Boards' willingness to bend to the desires of the development lobby), it will be a waste of tax payer dollars to move ahead with an EIR on Consent without hearing from stakeholders.

Be aware that General Plan Policies are the mitigation measures for approving development, and came from the GP EIR. When you amend, or fail to implement these policies, you are not honoring the County's promises to mitigate for development under CEQA. I don't think anyone wants a repeat of the 1996 General Plan fiasco with a Writ, or the 2004 General Plan which has been litigated against for failure to comply and be consistent with its own environmental policies, or continued spending for consultants when the BOS refuses to listen to staff or the consultant that their decisions are not consistent with their own GP or CEQA.

The original contract for the OWMP was approximately \$500k. Then there was the lawsuit – so there is the cost of staff time, outside counsel, and the settlement. The INRMP process, another GP implementation policy, also initially cost approximately \$500k. The INRMP was then hijacked by development interests (the same development interests running Regulatory Reform committee and involved in CEDAC) and it was quietly shelved. The INRMP could have solved the Pine Hill Rare Plant issue via a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) which would have allowed development and possibly an extension of Wild Chaparrel/Palmer Drive. The BOS at that time turned down a federal \$600k grant that was awarded. With the OWMP lawsuit, rare plant issues and lawsuits, how many millions of dollars have county taxpayers paid on failed policies due to the indiscretion of former Boards to politically choose to stray from CEQA consistency and instead comply with developer interests? Former Boards made promises to the residents of El Dorado County, and the residents voted for the 2004 General Plan, and many, many of those policies have not been implemented or were implemented buy not consistent with the intent of the policies.

Without clarity of the Scope of Work for this item, and stakeholder interest meetings prior to agendizing this item, you are doomed to repeat these failures.

Oak woodlands have biological habitat value and also drive property values and tourist spending in this county due to their aesthetic appeal. Please read the Oak Woodland Management Plan to learn more about how oak woodlands benefit the County.

Please pull this item from the Consent Calender and properly agendize it at a future meeting and invite stakeholders to attend. Otherwise, you are taking a path of wasting public funds, as it is quite feasible that you will lose yet another lawsuit that would likely be brought against El Dorado County.

Thank you,  
Monique Wilber  
Shingle Springs

Please attach this email to the item.





LATE DISTRIBUTION 3-11-14 EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

## Re: Oak Policy revisions on consent calendar

2 messages

**Karen Schambach** <csnckaren@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 8:49 AM

To: Craig Thomas <craig@sierraforestlegacy.org>

Cc: "<bosfour@edcgov.us>" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "<bosfive@edcgov.us>" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "<edc.cob@edcgov.us>" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "<Mwgraf@aol.com>" <Mwgraf@aol.com>

Dear Ron and Norma,

I agree with Craig completely. The protection of oak woodlands under the General Plan is a subject of intense interest in El Dorado County. It certainly merits a public discussion, not a Consent Calendar. Please pull this item from Consent.

Sincerely,

Karen Schambach

President

Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation

On Mar 10, 2014, at 9:52 PM, "Craig Thomas" <craig@sierraforestlegacy.org> wrote:

Dear Ron and Norma,

As a 34 year resident of District, and the owner of the first Certified Organic acres in El Dorado Co. I urge you to pull item #7 and the Dudek contract package off the consent calendar and have a full public discussion about changing policies in the County meant to protect oaks and oak woodlands.

The residents and visitors to El Dorado Co. value the oaks and oak woodlands that provide the very foundation for a healthy rural, agricultural landscape and way of life that is important to so many.

Oak trees and woodlands make up the ecological components of a vegetation type that is rare and increasingly fragmented in the foothills of California. Fragmentation ultimately leads to loss of ecological function and destruction of the natural values that make oak woodlands unique.

As a member of the Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation for nearly 30 years, I believe this consent action (proposed in the contract package) will cause significant conflict in (and outside ) the county and will ultimately be deemed lacking in long-term planning foresight. I also believe this proposal is contrary to California law and our settlement agreement in the general plan litigation.

Sincerely,

Craig Thomas

12-1203 Public Comment

BOS Rcvd 3-11-14 Page 1 of 1