

24



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Regarding BOS Agenda Item 12-0267 on May 15

1 message

Lori Parlin <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, May 14, 2012 at 12:12 PM

To: lou.rain@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, alan.tolhurst@edcgov.us, roger.trout@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us

Who Is Protecting My Property Rights?

Open Letter to El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, El Dorado Planning Commissioners, and Planning Services Director:

Please protect the rural characteristics of El Dorado County as your citizens have asked you to. Yes, we understand that economic development is important to sustaining a tax base. But instead of rezoning properties and disrupting quiet neighborhoods under the guise of economic development, how about supporting the current businesses we already have and improving the roadways that already exist? Use the undeveloped properties that are already zoned commercial instead of rezoning residential properties into commercial properties, or medium density land into high density land. Also, redevelop and improve existing commercial properties instead of rezoning property in a residential neighborhood. Don't the residents of El Dorado County have the right to expect you to protect our rights to enjoy our property in the rural setting that attracted us to El Dorado County in the first place?

I'm writing in regard to Agenda Item 12-0267 that is set for the May 15 Board of Supervisors meeting. Our local Chambers of Commerce are encouraging business owners to pack the meeting with businesspeople to give the appearance that county residents fully support rezoning our properties to spur on economic development. From a Chamber newsletter, "The zoning process will give property owners more flexibility pertaining to the usage of their land. This flexibility will make the County a more business friendly environment and encourage business, rather than discourage it." I would like to say, no, do not give property owners more flexibility with the usage of their land. Let them use it as it was intended when they bought it, and as surrounding property owners would expect it to be used when they bought their land. Why should newer property owners or undeveloped-land owners get priority over existing, established property owners and change our neighborhoods? I would like our Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors (BOS) to have the guts to tell anyone that wants to rezone a piece of residential or medium/low density property into commercial or high density property that El Dorado County residents like the spaciousness and rural feeling of our county and that we do not want another gas station, grocery store, hotel, or auto shop nearby. People that want more businesses next door to them should feel free to move to Folsom or Sacramento, not ask us to change our county to suit them.

Look at the comments made at the Land Use meeting held in El Dorado Hills back in March: <http://www.villagelife.com/news/land-use-policy-changes-under-way/>. Or read the article "What Residents Love About El Dorado!" in the Winter edition of Around Here Magazine. It is very clear that El Dorado County residents like its small town feel and open spaces. Please listen to us and respect our concerns. Do not repeat mistakes of the past and be awed by celebrity or money. Did you learn anything from the Bosio/Kniessel building? That is a prime example of rezoning gone wrong. Mr. Chris Bosio, a former Major League Baseball pitcher, wowed the

12-0267.51.Public Comment.1 of 1

BOS back in the 1990's to rezone his residential property to commercial property despite the concerns of the surrounding homeowners. After Bosio's popular Sports Central business closed, the county tried desperately for a decade to find a suitable business to purchase such a large building. When the Kriesel family bought the property, they downplayed the noises and smells that come from an auto collision center and were able to get a Special Permit from the BOS to put an auto collision business right alongside a residential neighborhood. Is this how our Planning Commission and BOS "protect property rights"? Don't the existing residents have property rights too? Please put a stop to the rezoning of our county. Preserve and support what is already here.

Lori Parlin

Shingle Springs, CA

#24



Regarding BOS Agenda Item 12-0267 on May 15

Lori Parlin <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, May 14, 2012 at 12:12 PM

To: lou.rain@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, alan.tolhurst@edcgov.us, roger.trout@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us

Who Is Protecting My Property Rights?

Open Letter to El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, El Dorado Planning Commissioners, and Planning Services Director:

Please protect the rural characteristics of El Dorado County as your citizens have asked you to. Yes, we understand that economic development is important to sustaining a tax base. But instead of rezoning properties and disrupting quiet neighborhoods under the guise of economic development, how about supporting the current businesses we already have and improving the roadways that already exist? Use the undeveloped properties that are already zoned commercial instead of rezoning residential properties into commercial properties, or medium density land into high density land. Also, redevelop and improve existing commercial properties instead of rezoning property in a residential neighborhood. Don't the residents of El Dorado County have the right to expect you to protect our rights to enjoy our property in the rural setting that attracted us to El Dorado County in the first place?

I'm writing in regard to Agenda Item 12-0267 that is set for the May 15 Board of Supervisors meeting. Our local Chambers of Commerce are encouraging business owners to pack the meeting with businesspeople to give the appearance that county residents fully support rezoning our properties to spur on economic development. From a Chamber newsletter, "The zoning process will give property owners more flexibility pertaining to the usage of their land. This flexibility will make the County a more business friendly environment and encourage business, rather than discourage it." I would like to say, no, do not give property owners more flexibility with the usage of their land. Let them use it as it was intended when they bought it, and as surrounding property owners would expect it to be used when they bought their land. Why should newer property owners or undeveloped-land owners get priority over existing, established property owners and change our neighborhoods? I would like our Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors (BOS) to have the guts to tell anyone that wants to rezone a piece of residential or medium/low density property into commercial or high density property that El Dorado County residents like the spaciousness and rural feeling of our county and that we do not want another gas station, grocery store, hotel, or auto shop nearby. People that want more businesses next door to them should feel free to move to Folsom or Sacramento, not ask us to change our county to suit them.

Look at the comments made at the Land Use meeting held in El Dorado Hills back in March:

Or read the article "What Residents Love About El Dorado" in the Winter edition of Around Here Magazine. It is very clear that El Dorado County residents like its small town feel and open spaces. Please listen to us and respect our concerns. Do not repeat mistakes of the past and be awed by celebrity or money. Did you learn anything from the Bosio/Kniessel building? That is a prime example of rezoning gone wrong. Mr. Chris Bosio, a former Major League Baseball pitcher, wowed the BOS back in the 1990's to rezone his residential property to commercial property despite the concerns of the surrounding homeowners. After Bosio's popular Sports Central business closed, the county tried desperately for a decade to find a suitable business to purchase such a large building. When the Kniessel family bought the property, they downplayed the noises and smells that come from an auto collision center and were able to get a Special Permit from the BOS to put an auto collision business right alongside a residential neighborhood. Is this how our Planning Commission and BOS "protect property rights"? Don't the existing residents have property rights too? Please put a stop to the rezoning of our county. Preserve and support what is already here.

Lori Parlin


Shingle Springs, CA

24

LATE DISTRIBUTION


DATE 5/14/12



TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION OF EL DORADO COUNTY
Post Office Box 18  Placerville, California 95667
Founded in 1958

2012 MAY 14 AM 9:31
HELEN
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

TO: John Knight, Chairman,
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

FROM: Ellen Day, President 

DATE May 14, 2012

REGARDING: Board Agenda Item # 24, Authorize staff to release Notice of Preparation for the EIR for the TGPA and ZOU

FROM: Ellen Day, President

The Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County recommends that the Board of Supervisors proceed to release the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR process on the Land Use Policy Programmatic Update (LUPPU). The Zoning Ordinance update is 7 years overdue, and the General Plan update is 3 years overdue. By law the Zoning Ordinance must conform to the land use policies of the General Plan, an update that is long overdue.

After release of the data, defined by the Targeted General Plan Amendments (TGPA) and Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU), the public has 45 days for review, which should be adequate to assess and submit comments. Further, to facilitate the collection of public input, the Board is scheduling a series of workshops on the proposed changes. These changes have been in the process of development over several years already, and covered by wide variety of workshops by EDAC participants, including ag interests, contractors, engineers, builders, ranchers, traffic experts, and many private property owners.

The Taxpayer Association strongly supports the EDAC efforts which they believe are long overdue since they will significantly improve the county's overall economic conditions. We have always favored changes in economic policies for reduced regulations, restrictions and taxes. In its letter dated July 18, 2011, the Taxpayers Association asserted that "El Dorado County is at the "Bottom of the Economic Barrel" relative to surrounding counties based on data from the Sacramento Bee on home sales, and commercial and industrial development. Per that letter:

What has caused this significant difference? Obviously having similar topography, resources, access to venues, etc. doesn't explain this disparity. Although El Dorado County is 20% larger, in the past ten years we have grown 16% while Placer County has grown 40%. Data indicates that people in search of a new home or businesses find El Dorado County's negative business policies unacceptable and go elsewhere--like Placer County. Needless and excessive detailed regulations, inordinately high fees, slow and laborious processes for permits and approvals are encountered with the county's administration departments that are under the control and leadership of the Board of Supervisors.

cc: Mountain Democrat
Auburn Journal
Tahoe Tribune
Village Life



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 5-11-12

24
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
EL DORADO COUNTY

Proposed General Plan Changes

2012 MAY 11 PM 3:43

1 message

Kathy Hurd <kathydhurd@gmail.com>

Fri, May 11, 2012 at 11:36 AM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us

Cc: Supervisor 5 <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Supervisor 4 <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Supervisor 3 <bosthree@edcgov.us>, John Knight <bosone@edcgov.us>, wgwillman <wgwillman@aol.com>, Green Valley Community <gvralliance@gmail.com>, Dennis & Darlene Neeley <daneeley@aol.com>, EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>, Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>, Larry Keenan <lobbythis@comcast.net>, Gary Hurd <gary@linkedreps.com>

Please add these comments to supervisors notes re: May 15 board meeting on proposed revisions of the El Dorado County general plan.

To: all El Dorado County Supervisors -

We reside in El Dorado Hills and have read and re-read the TPGA on proposed changes to the general plan and I am very concerned. Even though the GP is required to be updated every 4/5 years it does not mean that there needs to be changes.

This whole approach to amending the GP to affect a higher density is not consistent with what El Dorado Hills has worked so hard to preserve; namely a community that is made up of diverse villages with a focus on rural living and open space. The TPGA goes in the opposite direction in offering a reduction in open space, while knowing that the population is increasing. That makes no sense. More houses per lot, per acre, is not what the residents want. In addition the county has a long history of not funding infrastructure improvements when developments are constructed.

Along with the county planners, who I am sure are being asked to comply with new state guidelines, and therefore pushing these proposed higher density developments, i.e. Wilson Estates and the Dixon Ranch Project, your probably thinking that the county has no choice as it is now state law to increase these densities and you would be incorrect. The whole point of the new law is to have homes closer to where people work.

In the case of El Dorado Hills, we already have a business park that meets that criteria. The fact is that no matter what development is being considered, many more than 50% of the working people in EDH are going to go into Sacramento county. The remainder of hundreds of retirees are essentially "off the grid" as far as commuting and therefore are not a factor. This proves that there is essentially no justification for increasing the density. And if so, why is it only in EDH that it is being affected by this proposed GP change? What about the rest of the county? Why are they exempt? Who is really benefiting here?

Considering the fact that there are other development projects being discussed, i.e, Marble Valley by Serrano, and the development of the executive golf course on EDH blvd. into a mixed use project of single, multi, and condo/apartment structures, also by Serrano, all of the requirements of the law will be met, presuming that these projects are built.

Referring specifically to Dixon Ranch, a project with a proposed 714 homes, adjacent to Highland View and Sterlingshire, and Wilson Estates along Green Valley Rd. none of these projects should move forward until a plan is developed to deal with the impact of increased traffic and emissions that would be generated by such projects. As now constructed, Green Valley Rd. is totally

12-0267.51.Public Comment.1 of 5

inadequate to deal with the scope of these two projects. Dixon Ranch itself is way too large for the area that it is being proposed. A more reasonable number of homes in the 250-300 range is much more realistic and compatible with adjacent subdivisions.

Our concerns are about added traffic, added vehicle emissions, and public safety - all quality of life issues. These proposed plans would decrease our quality of life. There is absolutely no justification for pushing these developments with increased density into areas that are already compliant with the law and with the wishes of it's residents. In your deliberations on these matters please know that your vote affects thousands of EDH residents who deserve the highest consideration for their views. They pay the highest taxes, in volume, in the county which helps the county reach its financial goals. We are not against development when it is carefully planned and not just a way to get additional revenue.

Thank you all for preparing yourself for the board meeting on May 15 to discuss these matters. We are confident that, as Supervisors, you can sift through the TPGA and, though comprehensive, realize that it needs a lot of work to be acceptable to EDH residents.

Respectfully,

Kathy and Gary Hurd
2129 Loch Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
916.343.1519
Kathydhurd@gmail.com

24



Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Proposed General Plan Changes

1 message

Jim Zaiser <jimzaiser@jbiwater.com>

Fri, May 11, 2012 at 12:14 PM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bostfive@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, wwillman@aol.com

Cc: gvralliance@gmail.com, edc.cob@edcgov.us, kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us, cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us, Judy <judy@jbiwater.com>, Larry Keenan <lobbythis@comcast.net>

My neighbor is Larry Keenan and we have discussed this point several times. I think his email is well stated.

Please be advised that I am in agreement with him about the concerns for what developers (through the board) want to do to change El Dorado Hills. Our quality of life is at stake, as well as the added danger for our entry and exit to Sterlingshire, as well as the excessive emissions, traffic, and lack of road maintenance is a problem.

Other than looking for a "cash cow" for the county, there is no legitimate reason to approve these densities.

Please vote against these changes

Thanks

Jim and Judy Zaiser

Tartan Trail - EDH

To: all El Dorado County Supervisors -

I reside in El Dorado Hills and TPGA on proposed changes to the general plan and I am very concerned. Even though the GP is required to be updated every 4/5 years it does not mean that there needs to be changes.

This whole approach to amending the GP to affect a higher density is not consistent with what El Dorado Hills has worked so hard to preserve; namely a community that is made up of diverse villages with a focus on rural living and open space. The TPGA goes in the opposite direction in offering a reduction in open space, while knowing that the population is increasing. That makes no sense. More houses per lot, per acre, is not what the residents want. In addition the county has a long history of not funding infrastructure improvements when developments are constructed.

Along with the county planners, who I am sure are being asked to comply with new state guidelines, and therefore pushing these proposed higher density developments, i.e. Wilson Estates and the Dixon Ranch Project, you're probably thinking that the county has no choice as it is now state law to increase these densities and you would be incorrect. The whole point of the new law is to have homes closer to where people work.

In the case of El Dorado Hills, we already have a business park that meets that criteria. The fact is that no matter what development is being considered, many more than 50% of the working people in EDH are going to go into Sacramento county. The remainder of hundreds of retirees are essentially "off the grid" as far as commuting and therefore are not a factor. This proves that there is essentially no justification for increasing the density. And if so, why is it only in EDH that it is being affected by this proposed GP change? What about the rest of the county? Why are they exempt? Who is really benefiting here?

Considering the fact that there are other development projects being discussed, ice, Marble Valley by Serrano, and the development of the executive golf course on EDH blvd. into a mixed use project of single, multi, and condo.appt structures, also by Serrano, all of the requirements of the law will be met, presuming that these projects are built.

Referring specifically to Dixon Ranch, a project with a proposed 714 homes, adjacent to Highland View and Sterlingshire, and Wilson Estates along Green Valley Rd. none of these projects should move forward until a plan is developed to deal with the impact of increased traffic and emissions that would be generated by such projects. As now constructed, Green Valley Rd. is totally inadequate to deal with the scope of these two projects. Dixon Ranch itself is way too large for the area that it is being proposed. A more reasonable number of homes in the 250-300 range is much more realistic and compatible with adjacent subdivisions.

Our concerns are about added traffic, added vehicle emissions, and public safety - all quality of life issues. These proposed plans would decrease our quality of life. There is absolutely no justification for pushing these developments with increased density into areas that are already compliant with the law and with the wishes of it's residents. In your deliberations on

these matters please know that your vote affects thousands of EDH residents who deserve the highest consideration for their views. They pay the highest taxes, in volume, in the county which helps the county reach its financial goals.

We are not against development when it is carefully planned and not just a way to get additional revenue.

Thank you all for preparing yourself for the board meeting on May 15 to discuss these matters. We are confident that, as Supervisors, you can sift through the TPGA and, though comprehensive, realize that it needs a lot of work to be acceptable to EDH residents.

Respectfully,

Larry Keenan

3391 Tartan Trail

El Dorado Hills, CA 94762

916 933 9475

lobbythis@Comcast.net



Concern Over Proposed General Plan Changes

1 message

Cheryl McDougal <cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com>

Fri, May 11, 2012 at 2:07 PM

Reply-To: Cheryl McDougal <cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com>

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, tcpa-zou@edcgov.us, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

We are residents of El Dorado Hills, and chose this community to live due to the rural feel and a safe environment for our family. We are two of many concerned EDH residents over the proposed changes to the General Plan as it has the potential of eroding the very reason why we selected El Dorado Hills as a place to live.

Through these proposed changes to the General Plan, we believe that it will bring on much higher density which is not consistent with what the majority of residents have worked so hard to preserve. It will take away from the village and rural feel and significantly reduce the open space that has kept so much of the wildlife here as our neighbors. In addition, our current infrastructure has not kept pace with the current rate of development and based on current funding available, most likely, will not be expedited to support the proposed current land development projects.

A good example to site is the Dixon Ranch proposal whereby it encompasses 714 homes proposed of which is adjacent to Highland View and Sterlingshire, accessing Green Valley Road and Wilson Estates, which is also along Green Valley Road. It is unclear at best at this time what infrastructure will be required to be in place prior to any development. Green Valley is already not up to safety standards for the current traffic let alone the traffic that will be generated by these two projects. In addition, both of these projects could also add to the traffic on Malcolm Dixon Road, a substandard road. Increased traffic on Green Valley road dumps onto Allegheny Road near the signal which then dumps into the lower portion of Malcolm Dixon across the narrow bridges. Wilson Estates would dump directly onto the upper portion of Malcolm Dixon Road. We need to better understand how these projects could be approved without significant changes to current roads. If it is, this will put safety at increased risk for the current existing residents in this area.

These quality of issues include but are not limited to increased traffic and resulting public safety issues, added vehicle emissions, environmental impact and decreased open space for people and wildlife to habitate concurrently. It feels as if the county is currently trying to push this through in an expedited fashion without providing the general public with ample time to review the proposed changes, fully understand, and then share input with the County to enable the county to make the best decisions on behalf of their constituents.

Please understand that we are not against development and growth to assist with funding governmental services, but we need to make sure that it is not at the expense of the quality, safety and well being of our community.

Regards

John and Cheryl McDougal



24

Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

Proposed General Plan Changes

1 message

Jim Zaiser <jimzaiser@jbiwater.com>

Fri, May 11, 2012 at 12:14 PM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, wwillman@aol.com

Cc: gvralliance@gmail.com, edc.cob@edcgov.us, kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us, cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us, Judy <judy@jbiwater.com>, Larry Keenan <lobbythis@comcast.net>

My neighbor is Larry Keenan and we have discussed this point several times. I think his email is well stated.

Please be advised that I am in agreement with him about the concerns for what developers (through the board) want to do to change El Dorado Hills. Our quality of life is at stake, as well as the added danger for our entry and exit to Sterlingshire, as well as the excessive emissions, traffic, and lack of road maintenance is a problem.

Other than looking for a "cash cow" for the county, there is no legitimate reason to approve these densities.

Please vote against these changes

Thanks

Jim and Judy Zaiser

Tartan Trail - EDH

To: all El Dorado County Supervisors -

I reside in El Dorado Hills and TPGA on proposed changes to the general plan and I am very concerned. Even though the GP is required to be updated every 4/5 years it does not mean that there needs to be changes.

This whole approach to amending the GP to affect a higher density is not consistent with what El Dorado Hills has worked so hard to preserve; namely a community that is made up of diverse villages with a focus on rural living and open space. The TPGA goes in the opposite direction in offering a reduction in open space, while knowing that the population is increasing. That makes no sense. More houses per lot, per acre, is not what the residents want. In addition the county has a long history of not funding infrastructure improvements when developments are constructed.

Along with the county planners, who I am sure are being asked to comply with new state guidelines, and therefore pushing these proposed higher density developments, i.e. Wilson Estates and the Dixon Ranch Project, you're probably thinking that the county has no choice as it is now state law to increase these densities and you would be incorrect. The whole point of the new law is to have homes closer to where people work.

In the case of El Dorado Hills, we already have a business park that meets that criteria. The fact is that no matter what development is being considered, many more than 50% of the working people in EDH are going to go into Sacramento county. The remainder of hundreds of retirees are essentially "off the grid" as far as commuting and therefore are not a factor. This proves that there is essentially no justification for increasing the density. And if so, why is it only in EDH that it is being affected by this proposed GP change? What about the rest of the county? Why are they exempt? Who is really benefiting here?

Considering the fact that there are other development projects being discussed, ice, Marble Valley by Serrano, and the development of the executive golf course on EDH blvd. into a mixed use project of single, multi, and condo.appt structures, also by Serrano, all of the requirements of the law will be met, presuming that these projects are built.

Referring specifically to Dixon Ranch, a project with a proposed 714 homes, adjacent to Highland View and Sterlingshire, and Wilson Estates along Green Valley Rd. none of these projects should move forward until a plan is developed to deal with the impact of increased traffic and emissions that would be generated by such projects. As now constructed, Green Valley Rd. is totally inadequate to deal with the scope of these two projects. Dixon Ranch itself is way too large for the area that it is being proposed. A more reasonable number of homes in the 250-300 range is much more realistic and compatible with adjacent subdivisions.

Our concerns are about added traffic, added vehicle emissions, and public safety - all quality of life issues. These proposed plans would decrease our quality of life. There is absolutely no justification for pushing these developments with increased density into areas that are already compliant with the law and with the wishes of it's residents. In your deliberations on these matters please know that your vote affects thousands of EDH residents who deserve the highest consideration for their views. They pay the highest taxes, in volume, in the county which helps

12-0267.51.Public Comment.1 of 13

the county reach its financial goals.

We are not against development when it is carefully planned and not just a way to get additional revenue.

Thank you all for preparing yourself for the board meeting on May 15 to discuss these matters. We are confident that, as Supervisors, you can sift through the TPGA and, though comprehensive, realize that it needs a lot of work to be acceptable to EDH residents.

Respectfully,

Larry Keenan

3391 Tartan Trail

El Dorado Hills, CA 94762

916 933 9475

lobbythis@Comcast.net



Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

Proposed General Plan Changes

1 message

Harold Samboy <haroldcpa@hotmail.com>

Mon, May 14, 2012 at 5:57 AM

To: bostwo@edc.gov.us, cynthiajohnson@edcgov.us, kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us, bosfour@edgecgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

I live in El Dorado Hills.

I concur 100% with the contents of Larry Keenan's letter.

In fact, the intersection of Loch Way and Green Valley Road is already very dangerous.

Very truly yours,

Harold Samboy