

PO Box 929
Diamond Springs, CA 95619
Phone: 530.626.0836
http://www.rippnow.org
Email:getinvolved@rippnow.org

October 28, 2008

2008 OCT 28

BOARD OF SUFFICE

To the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

Attached are comments made at today's Board of Supervisors' meeting by members, and supporters of Residents Involved in Positive Planning, or RIPP, Inc. These comments are being made concerning the Board Agenda item regarding planning for the Materials Relocation Facility (MRF) and the report submitted by Geri Silva of the El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management.

These comments represent strong objection to the plan to locate the MRF on Industrial Drive in Diamond Springs, and should be regarded as part of the administrative record for this meeting. They should also be regarded as a statement that RIPP, Inc. is fully prepared to formally take their objection to this plan as far as is necessary by law. These documents are being submitted to the Board of Supervisors' office on this day, October 28, 2008.

Source Strong

**Laurel Stroud** 

Board Member, Residents Involved in Positive Planning, Inc.

My name is Becky Long and I am a Placerville resident and a member of RIPP, Inc.

EMD was given guidelines for researching the requirements and designs for a new MRF on the West Slope. RIPP felt at the time, and the resulting report confirms, that the standards were set too low and the guidelines provided for staff would favor the location that has been proposed from the start. The resulting report exemplifies a flawed process built on insufficient standards that have been crafted to narrow the field. And it is one that will ultimately benefit special interests.

Among others, these issues should be addressed:

- The grinder has been reported by a representative of Waste Connections to operate at 100 decibels. With daily green waste estimated at 130 tons, what size grinder will be needed and how many hours per day will it operate?
- Do the tonnage capacities include the estimated 100 tons per day from the casino?
- On what basis have the estimations for growth been calculated?
- As RIPP has stated previously, and based on research corroborated by NewPoint Group, a 15-acre site would be too small from the start and would allow no room at all for future growth. Twenty years is not nearly enough time for the investment that should be made in this county. Do you really want to do this again in 20 years?
- The report does not contain any information on requirements that it be distanced from residences, schools, and other areas of concentrated population.
- The report states that the site must be away from rivers and creeks. Why doesn't Indian Creek eliminate Industrial Drive as a potential site?
- Physical addresses of alternates are not provided, nor have they ever been. How
  does this provide for public involvement in the planning process?
- Regarding the six potential sites that are required by CEQA: Was Apple Hill was ever a true alternative? Or was it simply a red herring to provide a site that could be immediately eliminated?
- In Section 3B of the report the last bullet states, "The County could negotiate a new franchise extension...(etc.)" However, it is only Waste Connections that needs an extension, other companies are not even considered. The County has not put waste disposal out for bid since 1963.
- The criterion that the slope must be less that 20% is rather lame. Twenty percent is only 10 degrees. Do you mean to say that the Union Mine site doesn't have 15 acres of usable land amidst all the hundreds that are out there?
- The NewPoint Group report is referenced only selectively and when it supports the criterion for the Industrial Drive site.

These short-sighted guidelines demonstrate an astonishing lack of vision by this Board. Other counties are making upwards of \$2 Million per month on their waste recycling and disposal. Why should El Dorado County give away this potential revenue to a private interest?

I respectfully submit that it is time for courage and leadership, and that means you.

My name is Laurel Stroud and I am representing Residents Involved in Positive Planning, or RIPP, Inc.

The proposed MRF site on Industrial Drive is not large enough to accommodate a modern MRF, especially when you add in the trash and recyclables generated by the casino and its hotel, and also from all the hundreds of new houses planned for the west County area. That site will already be too small the day the MRF is completed, and the County will have to cast about for another site to start building a second bigger MRF. According to Eric Oddo, the Senior Civil Engineer for the West Placer Waste Management Authority, the very successful and profitable Placer County MRF serves about 200,000 people on a site of 40 acres. That's one acre for every 5,000 people per his estimate, and he says that site of 40 acres is already too small. To accommodate planned growth and to be able to operate effectively for 20-30 years or more, Placer County will need at least 60 acres, not 40. Why would El Dorado County try to operate on 17 acres, with perhaps an option for more, but still less than what Placer County is using right now. Please plan ahead for your constituents---don't just push ahead a project that is obsolete and financially disastrous, just to get it out of your hair.

That Industrial Drive site, if used, will then be irrevocably contaminated, all for no good reason (certainly not a valid planning reason) except that certain parties in the County want to make money for themselves and friends. It will be done for a shopping center that will probably fail in this disastrous current national financial climate. It will be another ghost town of buildings like upper Broadway. And all us citizens will pay for that failure just so the landowners around the current MRF site can make money. Especially in this very shaky economy, just how deep do you think the pockets are of the average citizen? How much pushing around and direct extractions from our wallets do you think people will stand? We the public not as stupid and monolithic as County officials apparently think we are. We see Placer County making

big money from their MRF, and we see EDC officials pushing a MRF that puts that same big profit potential into the hands of a waste hauler. And then the same County officials scream "poor" and wonder why they are millions of dollars in the hole.

By moving the MRF to Industrial Drive, the County will not only allow Waste Connections to own that property, but will also condemn the people of this county to pay for the construction of another MRF to accommodate growth. Waste Connections will have a permanent foothold in this county, without any rules as to whether they will cooperate in running their MRF in conjunction with a new MRF that will have to soon be added by the County.

Will we have two MRFs in competition with each other, or two MRFs that duplicate duties? Or will we have not one but two MRFs owned by Waste Connections if indeed the County again allows such monopolization? Is the County so lacking in the ability to create revenue for itself that it would allow ridiculous planning like this? Or is the problem that County officials are too scared to do anything truly inventive and creative? Is rolling over to big companies and big development just so easy and profitable to a few that it trumps all other action? RIPP Inc would hope that officials of the County want to be remembered for positive action and truly having the good of the people at heart. If they don't, they'll each be forever remembered as the true enemies of the private citizen of this County.

Good Afternoon,

My name is Michael Mueller and my family and I are members of RIPP and live in Diamond Springs.

Supervisors, it seems foolish and lax to have a new MRF built that does not make money for El Dorado County, such as Placer Co. and many other MRF's do.

To have some contracted hauler solely own the MRF, again, is just foolish planning and a refusal to look at what would benefit the county and future generations.

I mentioned Placer Co. as just one example.

Placer Counties JPA alone is making over \$2 million per month and paying the bonds that built and expanded their MRF, 10 years early. That alone saved the JPA over \$7 million!

In addition after completing a \$26 million expansion, they lowered the tipping fees to the users by almost \$2.00.

This sort of JPA is a Win, Win, Win for El Dorado County, the contracted hauler/operator and the environment.

EDC has no other option than to develop a JPA of its own. This is proven! It will make money for EDC instead of losing it. As we have seen in the latest budget process.

Respectfully,

Michael C Mueller, RCDD, DCCA 6696 Rhodes Ave.

My name is Toni Beers and I am a resident of Placerville and a member of RIPP, Inc.

RIPP, Inc. has studied a number of MRFs in various parts of the country. Without exception, the successful ones, no matter their size, are located well away from homes and businesses.

Los Angeles County MRFs are no exception. If a County as densely\_populated as L A County can locate a huge MRF and landfill away from homes and businesses, why can't a County as sparsely populated as El Dorado County do the same?

Even MRFs run in other areas by Waste Connections are situated in isolated areas. Close your eyes and envision their San Luis Obispo MRF — surrounded on one side by a Freeway and the other side by the Pacific Ocean! Now envision Industrial Drive off Missouri Flat Road — surrounded by homes, businesses, churches, senior facilities, traffic congestion — and schools. Question: Aren't there state regulations about the placement of dumps near schools?

Regardless of where MRFs are located, no matter how "high tech" or "state of the art" they may be — they all smell and they all have rodent and insect infestation!

It has to be obvious, even to the most naïve (and believe me, I don't consider any of you to be naïve) there will be odor, vermin, noise-light-and-chemical pollution, traffic congestion and public health problems.

By continuing to push the Industrial Drive site, the County shows a consistently disturbing lack of concern for the welfare of its citizens, and has the temerity to ask them not only to suffer this abomination silently, but to pay for it as well!

Why would any County Supervisor play with the health, welfare and property values of their constituency and expose the County to a protracted and costly lawsuit for CEQA violations in order to make a profit for a wealthy few?

To reiterate a comment made at the Diamond Springs CSD last week: Supervisor Sweeny, you are not doing it FOR us; you are doing it TO us!

My name is Richard Boylan and I am a member of Residents Involved in Positive Planning, or RIPP, Inc.

Since the County has started this process of moving the MRF to Industrial Drive and a great deal of money has been spent by parties involved, it is essential that the viability of this site be quickly determined. To move ahead with MRF planning means the CEQA EIR process must move ahead to comply with the law concerning streamlined permit review. A huge amount of information has been submitted to the El Dorado County Planning Dept by RIPP, Inc that must be included in the EIR, and that information must be given due consideration, not just blithely and irresponsibly waived aside as not applicable by the consultants doing the EIR, as has often been done with past EIRs.

RIPP, Inc, representing the citizens of El Dorado County, is extremely concerned with how this process is proceeding. While RIPP, Inc may be a new organization in the community, it is a significant force to be reckoned with. It has a large number of ardent supporters adamantly opposed to the Industrial Drive site. If examples are needed as to the strength of RIPP, Inc supporters, please note the 4400 individual signatures of county residents on the petitions opposing this MRF move. Also notes that these 4400 people will be watching what their particular Supervisor does about this issue, and will vote accordingly in the future. Recalls are not unheard of, nor is the possibility of upholding applicable CEQA law in a court action.

My name is Leonard Stroud, and I am the President of Residents Involved in Positive Planning.

In recent months, some Supervisors and County officials have made the statement that various sites in the County other than Industrial Drive are not suitable for a MRF because they don't have the proper zoning for it. So what is the problem with changing the zoning to the correct one when a good MRF site other than Industrial Drive is suggested? Seems pretty easy, doesn't it, since the Supervisors change zoning at will to fit their needs? I would imagine your answer is that you can't change zoning without changing the General Plan. So again what's the problem? You were quite ready to change the General Plan for a developer in order to push through the Placer Oaks project. Why not for a MRF that could make much bigger money for the County than could the tax money from those new Placer Oaks homes?

It seems very questionable and absurdly self-serving that rezoning is being done very frequently by Supervisors in order to accommodate projects for which Supervisors and their political supporters are involved. The recent Supervisors' vote for zoning changes to allow housing with no surrounding buffer areas in previously agricultural areas comes to mind. It seems the zoning in those cases was quickly and easily changed by Supervisors in order to facilitate what they wanted, with no regard to adjacent homeowners but lots of regard for big time development. How then is the apparent lack of proper zoning a problem for a new MRF site? What kind of shallow and personal profit-driven hypocrisy is this? If you're a big developer in this county, you can get anything, even apparently without proper permits in effect. If you are acting as an individual homeowner, the restrictions and costs to build or improve imposed by the County will kill your project.

Why do zoning changes and projects in general have to be such a deep, dark secret with the Board of Supervisors and Planners? What are they hiding from the public and why are things done behind backs and with as little public notice as possible? What is it you don't want us to know? And when the public does get involved, as with this MRF issue, we are told by a number of County officials that it's a "done deal" and we can't do anything about it, even before the EIR is completed. How can that be a done deal unless the law is broken? We get no support from our Supervisor in District 3---where are those public meetings you told us last March that you would have, Jack? And why does your appointed Planner, Dave Machado, behave in a completely uncooperative manner with the public and tell us this project is a "done deal". How can he legally say that? But we have witnesses that he has. And remember on March 26, Jack, that you told a group of 60 + people at a public meeting that you would "let us know when we need to worry or be involved" as far as this MRF issue? When will that be, Jack? We haven't heard from you yet.

It would seem the question of zoning is simply a useful smokescreen tool to be used at will by the County in order to shield their friends and insure them great profit, all the while having their hands in the pocket of the poor individual homeowner. We're the ones who are simply pushed around and bled financially to satisfy the bankrolls and egos of officials.

Please remember that a previous speaker mentioned that we have at least 4400 individual signatures on petitions from people all over the County who are adamantly opposed to moving the MRF to Industrial Drive. I said people from ALL OVER THE COUNTY. These people are from the districts of all the Supervisors. People know that, first of all, even though the MRF is planned for District 3, the cost of building a new one will come out of pockets all over the County. Also, the public will know their Supervisors did not protect them from this rip-off but chose to leave them at the mercy

of the self-serving aspirations of one Supervisor and a waste hauler. If perhaps this MRF move to Industrial Drive does go through, the people of the County will remember that you didn't protect them or help them, even if you are already out of office. What does that do to your reputation and to any other political aspirations you might have?

Please remember that 4400 people may be the amount of votes you got to be elected to office. 4400 people can also remove you from office, as you serve at the will of the people, not serving to slight the people due to lack of concern for them or disdain for what you might think are their "plebian" wishes. Your mark on the history of this county will be the good you did for them, not the notoriety you will gain from forcing your will down their throats.