



LATE DISTRIBUTION

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

24

DATE 5-11-12

TGPA, OZU

Bill Welty <[redacted]@gmail.com>

Mon, May 7, 2012 at 1:29 PM

[Redacted email header and body content]

In the interest of full disclosure, and "peer review", this is to request that prior (days not hours) to the May 15th BOS meeting where a vote is to be taken on the NOP for the TGPA and OZU.... that the BOS issue a public document, posting it to the website, identifying each proposed amendment, annotated as follows:

1. **why** each amendment is being made, distinguishing between those mandated by state law and others... (simple example: why change words like accident to crash, or re-evaluate the term "worsen"?)
2. **the source** of the amendment: staff?, edac?, local communities?, bos?
3. and the arguments for and against each one. I'm assuming the BOS wants a balanced recommendation from staff in making their decision to include, exclude, or modify any given change.

The public should understand more fully the logic, the motivation, behind each non-mandated amendment in order to raise the level of public comment from simply "don't like it" to something for substantive.

The success of the TGPA process is at stake. Notwithstanding the incredible efforts by DOT, CAO and planning staff to document, to circulate, outreach, to make public presentations....the TGPA process is failing to win the trust of the general public. Special interests are pleased; but there is such a dearth of references to support protecting and sustaining the quality of life in El Dorado County, mitigating traffic, sustaining open space, protecting public safety, etc.

I'm not looking for much; just a concession by the BOS, in writing, that growth, traffic, and open space are significant issues that need to be addressed as El Dorado County moves forward.... jobs and tax revenues are important...indeed! But the BOS would gain much by indicating a "sensitivity" to the quality of life issues as well.

Thanks for your time and for listening.

- Bill.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
2012 MAY 11 AM 9:11



The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

TGPA, OZU

Tara Mccann [redacted]

Wed, May 9, 2012 at 4:16 PM

[Redacted email body content]

I fully concur with the summation below. The ROI adopted by the Board back in Nov. 2011 and used as the framework of the scope for the TGPA & ZOU is heavily developer skewed and has not provided for public input. There has not been any public scoping workshop meetings yet and the CAO's office wants the Board to approve this description for the scope of the EIR of the TGPA on May 15th. This will not be taken well with the public and for the County to miss that is a huge mistake. We need to have more transparency and more dialog with the public to achieve a balanced TGPA & ZOU.

Tara Mccann

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Bill Welty [redacted]

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>; bostwo@edcgov.us; bosthree@edcgov.us; The BOSEQUIP

[Redacted email body content]

Sent: Mon, May 7,

Subject: TGPA, OZU

In the interest of full disclosure, and "peer review", this is to request that prior (days not hours) to the May 15th BOS meeting where a vote is to be taken on the NOP for the TGPA and OZU.... that the BOS issue a public document, posting it to the website, identifying each proposed amendment, annotated as follows:

1. **why** each amendment is being made, distinguishing between those mandated by state law and

others... (simple example: why change words like accident to crash, or re-evaluate the term "worsen"?)

2. the source of the amendment: staff?, edac?, local communities?, bos?
3. and the arguments for and against each one. I'm assuming the BOS wants a balanced recommendation from staff in making their decision to include, exclude, or modify any given change.

The public should understand more fully the logic, the motivation, behind each non-mandated amendment in order to raise the level of public comment from simply "don't like it" to something for substantive.

The success of the TGPA process is at stake. Notwithstanding the incredible efforts by DOT, CAO and planning staff to document, to circulate, outreach, to make public presentations....the TGPA process is failing to win the trust of the general public. Special interests are pleased; but there is such a dearth of references to support protecting and sustaining the quality of life in El Dorado County, mitigating traffic, sustaining open space, protecting public safety, etc.

I'm not looking for much; just a concession by the BOS, in writing, that growth, traffic, and open space are significant issues that need to be addressed as El Dorado County moves forward.... jobs and tax revenues are important...indeed! But the BOS would gain much by indicating a "sensitivity" to the quality of life issues as well.

Thanks for your time and for listening.

- Bill



TGPA, OZU

Bill Welty <mwelty@gmail.com>

Mon, May 7, 2012 at 6:43 PM

To: The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>



I'd like to have Briggs read it, soon, before the 15th, and comment. At issue: can he/they articulate why any one or all of the amendments are being considered. I can't find anyone who knows why... or who's interest is being served, regardless of whether it's good for the county, good for planning, good for communities, good for business, developers, etc.

For example, why was this change proposed:

*"Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. Within Community Regions, the mixed-uses may occur vertically and/or horizontally. In mixed use projects, the maximum residential density shall be **CHANGED FROM 16 TO 20** dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi-family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provided concurrent with development."*

Depending on **why** this policy is being amended, I would at least add language to require that appropriate traffic studies be completed, require county approval, on traffic and circulation impacts. And add, that no unit can be occupied until such mitigation measures are implemented to ensure that any resulting increase in traffic does not *worsened* the existing LOS in the impacted area.

To reference "adequate ...roadways" as an a priori condition fails to address the impacts of increasing the number of units from 16 to 20.

Thanks Brenda....

- Bill.

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.



GP amendment concern

DG [REDACTED]
To: bosfour@edcgov.us

Wed, May 9, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Dear Supervisor,

I have significant concerns about the Target Plan Amendments being discussed. One of my specific concerns regards the Policy below. Please explain why this change is being made; and benefit to the county. Looks like it needlessly increases density without community benefit. Please vote **against** this amendment being considered in changing the General Plan.

***"Policy 2.1.1.3**Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. Within Community Regions, the mixed-uses may occur vertically and/or horizontally. In mixed use projects, the maximum residential density shall be **CHANGED FROM 16 TO 20** dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi-family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provided concurrent with development."*

I have three additional major issues with the proposed changes: 1) Net impacts to Traffic (ref. LOS F) and public safety (including correcting current major EDH circulator line of site visibility limitations and inadequately designed egress/ingress from and to the circulators)

2) Reductions in current open space requirements/criteria will result in elimination of the Quality of life (more destruction of the natural environment, including wildlife habitat in future residential developments)

3) Changes in Planned Development criteria/requirements that result in further densification. The overriding concern is that the required infrastructure improvements must be implemented prior to or concurrently with development. El Dorado County has a long history of not being able to fully fund required infrastructure enhancements dictated by development impacts concurrent with the impacts invoked, and have recently reduced the EDH RIF fees, which further exacerbates the problem of the cumulative impacts of decades of underfunded road expansions/improvements.

Regards,

Dale and Linda Gretzinger

1100 Mill Circle



Proposed General Plan Changes

Larry Keenan <lobbythis@comcast.net>

Mon, May 7, 2012 at 5:06 PM

To: Supervisor 5 <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Supervisor 4 <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Supervisor 3 <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Supervisor 2 <bostwo@edcgov.us>, John Knight <bosone@edcgov.us>

Cc: [REDACTED]
<da

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 -

I 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.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

2201 Tenthon Trail
