

To: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
From: Sue Taylor
Re: July 28, 2009 BOS meeting, Agenda item #23, file # 09-0906, McCann Subdivision

2009 JUL 28 PM 5:00
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
RECEIVED

Dear Supervisors:

I have concerns about any approval of this project which was brought forward under a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The MND is deficient in addressing the result of cumulative impacts due not only to this project, but the 19 projects identified for the El Dorado/Diamond Springs area. Not only are area residents concerned about this effect, but so is the Mother Lode Union School District, as represented by a letter from their counsel to this end. The response to their concerns, in particular to the cumulative effects on traffic circulation was unsettling.

In particular, the staff memo from DOT staff Adam Baughman to Planning staff Tom Dougherty, labeled Attachment 3 and dated March 16, 2009, rather proves the point of the communities' concerns regarding the fact that El Dorado County needs to conduct an EIR to study the cumulative effects of 19 new subdivision projects. In the memo, Mr. Baughman states that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was conducted on the McCann project in conjunction with one other nearby project. This study modeled out that just the two projects together would generate 2,080 Average Daily Trips. What the community, and the school district want to know, is how many trips will NINETEEN projects generate? In the staff memo, Mr. Baughman also mentions that the Level of Service (LOS - the traffic congestion) is PRESENTLY at LOS "F" for Pleasant Valley & Forni Road, and LOS "E" for Pleasant Valley & Patterson at peak times of the day.


How can you, in good conscience, representing your community constituents, go forward with approving ANY project in this area without a complete study of the cumulative effects of the 19 projects on the entire community?

And these 19 projects do not only affect traffic - community residents do not want to lose the historic and cultural heritage of their communities which will happen if the entire area is not studied as a whole.

Others have brought up very valid points - why would you gratuitously allow narrower sidewalks when the project is between two schools, except to save the developer some money in pouring concrete, and disregard the health and safety of residents and schoolchildren?

Were the recommendations from your own professional staff discarded for Agricultural Policy 8.1.3.1 in favor of the developer lobbyists' rewriting of the "interpretation" in order for projects such as this one, which abuts Ag land, to go through and be approved quickly, avoiding your Ag Commission? A call to the Ag Commissioner informed me that one of the adjacent ranches would basically be classified as a hobby farm. The bottom line is that we are losing farm/cattle land due to encroachment by development, which is what 8.1.3.1 was supposed to protect. Why are only commercial operations important? Why are the smaller parcels with Ag operations not important, "hobbyist" or not? The county will be losing 10-12 acres of choices soils. We need to go back to the recommendations of the Ag Commission who after careful consideration had recommended criteria to be followed in converting prime Ag lands into housing developments.

The community is watching. We expect you to do the right thing by all of your constituents, not just the developer lobbyists who contribute towards your campaigns and invite you to their Monday night meetings.

Sincerely,

Sue Taylor
Resident

cc: BOS Dists 1-5, PING.