

Vern and Phyllis Miller  
2040 Casa Roble Lane  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
916-933-2760                      verndmiller@yahoo.com

---

October 23, 2009

To: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

Subject: Support for Diamante Project  
Rezone request Z06-0027  
Agenda Item 26 – October 27, 2009

We would like to express our support for the Diamante project. We would have preferred to appear personally but are out of the area for a few weeks. We appeared before you when we opposed, or had serious questions, of some projects in our immediate area. We, therefore, felt it was proper to support what we do feel is a good project. There are a few changes we would prefer to have included but the overall project appears to be well planned and in conformance with the basic zoning and surrounding rural character of the area.

We have lived adjacent to lot 1 of this project for over 35 years. As with most residents of this area we would prefer to have this parcel left undeveloped but in recognition of the rights of property owners, we do recognize their rights to develop this parcel.

Changes we would prefer to see are:

1. This project, along with others in this area, request that the project be gated. In general, the Board of supervisors needs to determine if the proliferation of “gated communities” in our county and area is long term beneficial to our area. It would appear that such gated areas are not in keeping with the rural character that seems desired by most residents. It also seems that these “gates” impede the ability to use these areas for walking or biking. In the case of Malcolm Dixon Road, leaving these projects ungated may reduce the very real hazards for walkers and bikers due to the east west alignment of a portion of the road that makes it very difficult to see walkers or bikers in the morning or afternoon due to the position of the sun.
2. The Department of Transportation has mandated that a connecting road between Malcolm Dixon Road and Green Valley Road be constructed before any lots are sold. We support the road requirement but DOT steadfastly insists it be put in the wrong location. The location at the S curve, as mandated by the DOT, would not best serve to reduce traffic going downhill towards Salmon Falls Road. It may reduce some existing traffic from the Arroyo Vista area but does very little to mitigate the increased traffic that will be resultant from portions of the Diamante and La Canada projects. Moving the location

of the road toward the historic schoolhouse would much improve the impact of the road to reduce traffic on Malcolm Dixon Road where it crosses the two narrow bridges at the Salmon Falls end. It would also make a safer intersection at Green Valley Road. The cost would also likely be no more, or even less, due to not having to completely rebuild the S Curve – after it has just been repaved. It would also eliminate the need for the developers of Diamante to “abandon” about one half acre of property.

**The Board of Supervisors should make their own inspection and analysis of this situation and not rely on the assurances of the DOT. The “S” curve has historic implications and is completely safe as currently constructed and with the centerline indicators.** The traffic studies by DOT are flawed in their conclusions when considering all factors - i.e. direction of areas of major traffic draws, location of traffic signals, need to cross uncontrolled traffic, etc.

The traffic situation illustrates one other flaw in the planning process. CEQA mandates that impacts from all known or potential projects be considered as an aggregate. Planning tries to state these projects are unrelated and are to be considered as separate projects when they, in fact, are adjacent to each other and do have cumulative impacts. The traffic analysis is one example of reviewing on a piecemeal basis. It is interesting to note that even though the impacts are considered as individual projects, the funding for the crossroad improvements are a joint responsibility of these projects.

3. Water is a problem in our immediate area. We, along with several of our adjacent neighbors, would like to request that a water line be extended to a point where it could provide a connection with EID water to our property and then on thru our property to our neighbors. An easement for such a water line could be provided along the Northern boundary of the project along the property line that connects to the Chartraw parcel. I have talked to both EID and LAFCO and they are both receptive to our application for inclusion in the EID district.

In Summary, we do support this project and request approval by the Board of Supervisors. We do recognize that the requests brought up in items 1 and 2 are more related to county and administrative policies and decisions than they are a reflection on the developers of Diamante.

Respectfully submitted,

Vern and Phyllis Miller