

#42



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 12/14/15

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS 12/15/15

Vote

1 message

Diane Williams <dimo66@att.net>

Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 9:31 AM

To: bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors Mikulaco, Veerkamp, Ranalli, and Novasel,

I request that you do not approve the rezoning of thousands of parcels in El Dorado County. The rezone at the intersection of Ponderosa Road and Highway 50 is an example of how the community of Shingle Springs was left out of the process and not informed about the negative impacts to traffic and quality of life from these rezones. Instead of these rezones, I ask that you use our County resources to protect our existing Community Identity in Shingle Springs as a peaceful country community of homes and ranches on acreage.

Thank you to Supervisor Frentzen for voting No on these rezones and the TGPA.

Sincerely,

Diane and Jim Williams
Rescue, CA

In "Abuse of Power"

Please attend the Board of Supervisors meeting on 11/10/15 to overhaul our current 2004 "voter approved" General Plan and Zoning Ordinance
In "El Dorado County"

37,000 parcels rezoned without public input in El Dorado County

In
"



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

TGPA/ZOU Final vote on 12-15-15

1 message

Susan Statti <susanstatti@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 11:52 AM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors Mikulaco, Veerkamp, Ranalli, and Novasel,

I request that you do not approve the rezoning of thousands of parcels in El Dorado County. The rezone at the intersection of Ponderosa Road and Highway 50 is an example of how the community of Shingle Springs was left out of the process and not informed about the negative impacts to traffic and quality of life from these rezones. Instead of these rezones, I ask that you use our County resources to protect our existing Community Identity in Shingle Springs as a peaceful country community of homes and ranches on acreage.

Thank you to Supervisor Frentzen for voting No on these rezones and the TGPA.

Sincerely,

Susan Statti
Shingle Springs



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Flaws Remain in TGPA/ZOU Findings and SOC

1 message

Tom <tomi@volcano.net>
To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 2:44 PM

Dear BOS & Long Range Planning Staff,

I have reviewed the 12/15/15 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the TGPA/ZOU. The flaws in those documents, that I noted in my 8/27/15 comments to the Planning Commission, remain. (See attached and below)

Sincerely,

Tom Infusino, for RCU

To: County of El Dorado

From: Tom Infusino, for RCU

RE: Renewing Objections to TGPA/ZOU Findings of Fact and SOC

Date: 12/13/15

In my comments on behalf of RCU to the Planning Commission on 8/27/15, I noted several substandard aspects of the Draft Findings of Fact. Despite the County making some modifications to the draft findings, my review of the proposed findings of fact for 12/15/15 reveals that these same flaws remain.

Flawed Sections of Findings of Fact 12/15/15

Legal Effect of Findings

Findings on Alternatives

Alternative 1

Alternative 3

Development on Slopes over 30%

Home Occupations

Impact: Aesthetics

Impact: Agricultural Land Conversion

Impact: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses

Impact: Transportation and Traffic

Impact: Water Supply

Impact AES-1 Scenic Vistas

Impact AES-3 Development on Slopes over 30%

Impact AQ-5 Air Pollution

Impact PH-1 Population Growth

Impact TRA-1 Traffic

Impact WS-1 Water Supply

Impact WS-2 Groundwater

In my comments on behalf of RCU to the Planning Commission on 8/27/15, I noted several substandard aspects of the Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC). My review of the proposed SOC for 12/15/15 reveals that these same flaws remain.



Flaws in Findings and SOC Remain.docx

15K

To: County of El Dorado

From: Tom Infusino, for RCU

RE: Renewing Objections to TGPA/ZOU Findings of Fact and SOC

Date: 12/13/15

In my comments on behalf of RCU to the Planning Commission on 8/27/15, I noted several substandard aspects of the Draft Findings of Fact. Despite the County making some modifications to the draft findings, my review of the proposed findings of fact for 12/15/15 reveals that these same flaws remain.

Flawed Sections of Findings of Fact 12/15/15

Legal Effect of Findings

Findings on Alternatives

Alternative 1

Alternative 3

Development on Slopes over 30%

Home Occupations

Impact: Aesthetics

Impact: Agricultural Land Conversion

Impact: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses

Impact: Transportation and Traffic

Impact: Water Supply

Impact AES-1 Scenic Vistas

Impact AES-3 Development on Slopes over 30%

Impact AQ-5 Air Pollution

Impact PH-1 Population Growth

Impact TRA-1 Traffic

Impact WS-1 Water Supply

Impact WS-2 Groundwater

In my comments on behalf of RCU to the Planning Commission on 8/27/15, I noted several substandard aspects of the Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC). My review of the proposed SOC for 12/15/15 reveals that these same flaws remain.



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

TGPA/ZOU Final vote on 12-15-15

1 message

Bill Statti <bstatti@gmail.com>

Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 3:36 PM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>, bosone@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors Mikulaco, Veerkamp, Ranalli, and Novasel,

I request that you do not approve the rezoning of thousands of parcels in El Dorado County. The rezone at the intersection of Ponderosa Road and Highway 50 is an example of how the community of Shingle Springs was left out of the process and not informed about the negative impacts to traffic and quality of life from these rezones. Instead of these rezones, I ask that you use our County resources to protect our existing Community Identity in Shingle Springs as a peaceful country community of homes and ranches on acreage.

Thank you to Supervisor Frentzen for voting No on these rezones and the TGPA.

Sincerely,

Bill Statti
Shingle Springs



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

TGPA-ZOU - Flaws in County Response to Comments

1 message

Tom <tomi@volcano.net>

Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 6:33 PM

To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Hi BOS & Long Range Planning,

In our comments to the Planning Commission on 8-27-15, RCU commenters identified lists of their comments on the TGPA/ZOU EIR and RDEIR that were not adequately responded to by the County. Attached I note that comments echoing RCU concerns were submitted by others, and were also inadequately responded to by the County. Please consider this prior to certifying the EIR on 12/15/15.

Sincerely,

Tom Infusino, for RCU

To: El Dorado County BOS and Long Range Planning

From: Tom Infusino, for RCU

RE: Inadequate Responses to Comments on the DEIR & RDEIR for the TGPA/ZOU

Date: 12/13/15

Prior to the Planning Commission hearing on the TGPA/ZOU, members of RCU presented lists of their comments on the TGPA/ZOU that were not adequately responded to by the County. Upon review of the FEIR being proposed for certification on 12/15/15, I have the following additional observations regarding the County's inadequate response to comments.

First, comments by RCU regarding flaws in the traffic analysis were also echoed by Caltrans in its letter of May 5, 2015. The County's responses to those concerns (S-Recirc 3-7, and S-Recirc 3-8) are again not responsive to the issues raised.

Response 3-7 refers to a number of planned parallel roadways that MAY be constructed to reduce FUTURE impacts on Highway 50. However, the TGPA/ZOU is rezoning parcels NOW. It is identifying parcels as allegedly suitable for a density of development NOW. There are no conditions on these rezones (since rezones are not conditioned) that will prevent such levels of development regardless of the construction (whenever, if ever) of the parallel roadway capacity. Since funding is insufficient in the near term, and priorities shift annually,

the existence of a TIM Fee program is insufficient insurance to fully mitigate these highway impacts. Furthermore, Response 3-8 acknowledges the potential for "super cumulative" impacts associated with the approval currently proposed developments. Whereas the federal, state and regional interests represented by Caltrans in its responsible management of Highway 50 reflect a reasonable accommodation of competing regional interests; the parochial and self-serving interests of the El Dorado County TGPA/ZOU, and additional proposed developments, do not.

Second, comments by RCU regarding flaws in the traffic analysis were also echoed by the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee in its letter of March 18, 2015. Response 1-4 does not explain why the County refuses to use a model in the TGPA/ZOU that will evaluate the Level of Service at local intersections. It also does not explain how the County and Caltrans will work together to meet Caltrans requirements for Highway 50 as the County implements the TGPA/ZOU.

Third, the responses to comments by the Board of Forestry (7/17/4) do not explain why the TGPA/ZOU, which states as an objective to bring the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance into compliance with state law, is not trying to bring the Safety Element into compliance with the fire safety requirements for a Safety Element in Government Code sec. 65302. (S-5-2). While the response identifies a number of General Plan provisions regarding fire safety that limit subdivision approvals, it does not explain the rationale for zoning lands for development NOW that do not currently meet those fire safe standards, and are unlikely to in the future (S-5-3).

Fourth, RCU concerns regarding the rezoning around Bass Lake are echoed in comments by Kathleen Prevost, and her 35 pages of supporting information. In her comments, Ms. Prevost identifies an inconsistency between the TGPA/ZOU and the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan, and the 2004 General Plan. She also identifies an internal conflict within the TGPA/ZOU. Such plan conflicts are potentially significant impacts under CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist, Item X Land Use Planning.) The County's response incorrectly claimed the comment did not raise "a significant environmental point," "did not raise an environmental issue in the context of the TGPA/ZOU EIR," and that "no response is necessary" (Responses I-37-2 and I-37-3; I-37-6, I-37-7, I-37-8 through I-37-11; I-37-12; I-37-13, I-37-14, I-37-24, I-37-25 .) Ms. Prevost went on to identify potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed inappropriate zoning designation including impacts to wetlands, migratory bird habitat, bald eagle habitat, miscellaneous bird habitat, and a historic site. These are the types of impacts that are considered in CEQA reviews (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Checklist, Items IV Biological Resources and V Cultural Resources.) In each instance the County's response incorrectly indicated that "no response is necessary." (Responses I-37-15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, -21.)



Flawed Responses to Comment echoing RCU concerns re TGPA-ZOU.docx

18K

To: El Dorado County BOS and Long Range Planning

From: Tom Infusino, for RCU

RE: Inadequate Responses to Comments on the DEIR & RDEIR for the TGPA/ZOU

Date: 12/13/15

Prior to the Planning Commission hearing on the TGPA/ZOU, members of RCU presented lists of their comments on the TGPA/ZOU that were not adequately responded to by the County. Upon review of the FEIR being proposed for certification on 12/15/15, I have the following additional observations regarding the County's inadequate response to comments.

First, comments by RCU regarding flaws in the traffic analysis were also echoed by Caltrans in its letter of May 5, 2015. The County's responses to those concerns (S-Recirc 3-7, and S-Recirc 3-8) are again not responsive to the issues raised.

Response 3-7 refers to a number of planned parallel roadways that MAY be constructed to reduce FUTURE impacts on Highway 50. However, the TGPA/ZOU is rezoning parcels NOW. It is identifying parcels as allegedly suitable for a density of development NOW. There are no conditions on these rezones (since rezones are not conditioned) that will prevent such levels of development regardless of the construction (whenever, if ever) of the parallel roadway capacity. Since funding is insufficient in the near term, and priorities shift annually, the existence of a TIM Fee program is insufficient insurance to fully mitigate these highway impacts. Furthermore, Response 3-8 acknowledges the potential for "super cumulative" impacts associated with the approval currently proposed developments. Whereas the federal, state and regional interests represented by Caltrans in its responsible management of Highway 50 reflect a reasonable accommodation of competing regional interests; the parochial and self-serving interests of the El Dorado County TGPA/ZOU, and additional proposed developments, do not.

Second, comments by RCU regarding flaws in the traffic analysis were also echoed by the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee in its letter of March 18, 2015. Response 1-4 does not explain why the County refuses to use a model in the TGPA/ZOU that will evaluate the Level of Service at local intersections. It also does not explain how the County and Caltrans will work together to meet Caltrans requirements for Highway 50 as the County implements the TGPA/ZOU.

Third, the responses to comments by the Board of Forestry (7/17/4) do not explain why the TGPA/ZOU, which states as an objective to bring the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance into compliance with state law, is not trying to bring the Safety Element into compliance with the fire safety requirements for a Safety Element in Government Code sec. 65302. (S-5-2). While the response identifies a number of General Plan provisions regarding fire safety that limit subdivision approvals, it does not explain the rationale for zoning lands for development NOW that do not currently meet those fire safe standards, and are unlikely to in the future (S-5-3).

Fourth, RCU concerns regarding the rezoning around Bass Lake are echoed in comments by Kathleen Prevost, and her 35 pages of supporting information. In her comments, Ms. Prevost identifies an inconsistency between the TGPA/ZOU and the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan, and the 2004 General Plan. She also identifies an internal conflict within the TGPA/ZOU. Such plan conflicts are potentially significant impacts under CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines

Appendix G, Checklist, Item X Land Use Planning.) The County's response incorrectly claimed the comment did not raise "a significant environmental point," "did not raise an environmental issue in the context of the TGPA/ZOU EIR," and that "no response is necessary" (Responses I-37-2 and I-37-3; I-37-6, I-37-7, I-37-8 through I-37-11; I-37-12; I-37-13, I-37-14, I-37-24, I-37-25 .) Ms. Prevost went on to identify potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed inappropriate zoning designation including impacts to wetlands, migratory bird habitat, bald eagle habitat, miscellaneous bird habitat, and a historic site. These are the types of impacts that are considered in CEQA reviews (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Checklist, Items IV Biological Resources and V Cultural Resources.) In each instance the County's response incorrectly indicated that "no response is necessary." (Responses I-37-15, -16, -17, -18, -19, -20, -21.)



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Rezone of Shingle Springs

1 message

The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>

Mon, Dec 14, 2015 at 8:13 AM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Kathy Witherow

Assistant to Supervisor Brian K. Veerkamp
District Three - El Dorado County
530.621.5652

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Leslie Davis** <lesandjesdavis@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Dec 12, 2015 at 8:17 AM

Subject: Rezone of Shingle Springs

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

BOS,

Are you people crazy or just having a bad day. I live in the heart of the Shingle Springs Rezone.
Not only was I never notified, but this whole plan is a total joke and illegal.

STOP THE REZONE OF SHINGLE SPRINGS.

Leslie and Jesse Davis

[REDACTED]
Shingle Springs, CA 95682



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: TGPA/ZOU - The Time Is Now!

1 message

The BOSTHREE <bostthree@edcgov.us>

Mon, Dec 14, 2015 at 8:36 AM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Kathy WitherowAssistant to Supervisor Brian K. Veerkamp
District Three - El Dorado County
530.621.5652

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Doug Hus** <doughus61@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Dec 13, 2015 at 5:15 PM

Subject: TGPA/ZOU - The Time Is Now!

To: Brian Veerkamp <bostthree@edcgov.us>, Mike Ranalli <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Board of Supervisors:

It's time! Let's move this county forward, let's not give in to special interest once again and let's not be ignorant to the value a giant step like this update can be for this county. We have had our hands tied for longer than I can remember. Your vote to approve the general plan amendment and zoning ordinance update is instrumental here to taking back our county. I'm tired of the talk, it's time for action. Thanks for your commitment to the betterment of our community!

Sincerely,

Doug Hus

Doug Hus

Broker CalBRE#01262840

Capital Valley Realty Group, Inc.

[REDACTED]
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you believe that you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify the sender immediately.