PUBLIC COMMENT 6/22/15
E. VANDYKE

3 Minutes- Ellen Van Dyke - Bio Policy- BOS Monday 6/22/15

I want to confirm my support of keeping the Option A retention standards.

Residents WANT our resources protected - we are not trying to 'stop' this process. But the process is clearly being rushed. We've been given a 'summary' of policy changes, which is great, but the public needs to see final drafts.

The staff memo boasts of multiple meetings for public outreach. But in the 3 years since Option B was overturned, has staff ever said "*we're considering removing the tree retention requirements, and reducing stream setback protections - what do you think of that?*" Instead residents were told the 2004 protections were being implemented.

Then just days before the meeting, first in May, then again this last week, hundreds of pages of policy and material were posted without adequate time for public review and comment. But Staff repeats that they've done their outreach: the public has been informed.

I would beg to differ. Where are the *final* drafted policies? Have the public concerns and suggestions been addressed, or have they been waved away? The timeline is so tight the public comment has not all been posted. Where is the Calif Wildlife Foundation letter from May, reminding you that the County's trees and woodlands are one of our greatest assets?

From the 'summary' of changes, policy 7.4.1.6 is said to have the text "revised" and moved to policy 7.4.1.1. But what I see under 7.4.1.1 is the addition of the words "where feasible". Where exactly is the relocated text and how is it revised? I understand policy. I do not understand how *this* is informing me of the policy changes.

So here we are today with staff saying they've done EXTENSIVE public outreach, the public has been informed, and <u>you</u> are being asked to make some very important decisions based on policies the public has not vetted, and has not truly been included in.

So what do I want? I want

- to see the final drafted policies.
- I want time to review the posted materials, and make meaningful comment.
- I want the public comments to be posted for review, because residents have valuable public input that can make these policies better
- I want staff to actually LISTEN to that input, and incorporate it where appropriate.
- I *don't* want an EIR launched & resources wasted on policies that are not supported by the public

Please continue this item and allow the community time to review the policies, or the result will be hundreds of pages of public comment on the EIR and continuing public dissatisfaction.

California Wildlife Foundation
428 13th Street, Suite 10A
Oakland, CA 94612

www.californiawildlifefoundation.org
tel 510.208.4436
fax 510.268.9948

May 11, 2015

Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County
330 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Honorable Supervisors:

Word has come to California Wildlife Foundation/California Oaks that you are about to gut the El Dorado County Oak Ordinance. This should not even be considered at this time or place.

Surely Climate Change science has reached El Dorado County by now. Have the impacts of the ongoing drought not reached you? Watershed science information has made it very clear that keeping oak trees standing produces good economic and scientific returns. Ensuring sustainable wildlife habitat is a widely-approved of value throughout California, and one that most voters endorse.

Giving developers the tools to remove your green capital doesn't seem to be a very wise path now – nor ever.

The lands and woodlands you propose to destroy are one of your greatest assets. Surely El Dorado doesn't want to lead the way in having California become a Third World Country. El Dorado representatives should not be squandering the county's natural resources which support the community as a whole in exahange for short-term gains for a few.

Please give consideration to strengthening your oak ordinances, not crippling them!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janet Cobb

Janet S. Cobb, Executive Officer

Enclosures: Newsletter