

January 4, 2011

To:

John Knight, Supervisor, District 1
Ray Nutting, Supervisor, District 2
Jack Sweeney, Supervisor, District 3
Ron Briggs, Supervisor, District 4
Norma Santiago, Supervisor, District 5

I am writing this letter on behalf of the homeowners on Pilot Creek Lane, which is east of the proposed "Sundance" subdivision.

There are 17 properties on Pilot Creek Lane and Court. There have been 4 foreclosures in the past three years on our street. This is not El Dorado Hills or an affluent area. The majority of the homeowners on our street and in the area are retired and are on fixed incomes

This brings up the subject of water availability. Chris Beauchamps hydrology report implies that if there is a loss of water to the adjoining parcels they could put in a storage tank. Most of us already have storage tanks and multiple wells. Why should those who do not be required to do so for the sake of re-zoning and developing? And - what if water disappears? What are we retired/fixed income people supposed to do? If Mr. Beauchamp can't afford to bring in water how is the surrounding area supposed to afford to hook up to GDPUD? Don't you think we would have if we could have by now? We would love not to have the constant worry regarding adequate water and its quality.

Chris Beauchamp knew what he was buying in 2002. It was zoned AG. I read in the paper this last year that El Dorado County was proposing re-zoning parcels to AG so why would you consider changing zoning from AG? It does not make sense. The surrounding area to the West and North all have very large parcels. Let this land conform with those larger parcels rather than the smaller ones to the east and south.

You need to read and study the water report that Bill Bennett, who is a licensed engineer and worked for the Department of Water Resources, prepared for the Planning Commission. It disputes the report done by an out

of area hydrologist that Mr. Beauchamp hired. Bill Bennett used facts and real data derived from the Pilot Hill lookout using less assumptions than the hydrology report done by the applicant. His report shows that if Sundance is developed the well recharge rate for the surrounding area will diminish. As of now, you have two similar reports with very different results. One done by the applicant and submitted to the County and one by Bill Bennett. All the technical studies were done by the applicant and approved by the County for submission in the proposal. Was the reviewer at the County qualified to make this determination? Using the 10% rule, which seems to have been the deciding factor for approval at the 11-18 meeting Bill Bennett's report seems to have been disregarded and should not have been. Is there a County contingency plan that would subsidize GDPUD water to be brought in if approval of this subdivision depletes our wells on the East side of Sundance? And what about the South and West sides that are out of the GDPUD area?

In regards to the minutes of the 11-18 Planning Commission Meeting made by Mr. Laurie regarding water. He makes it sound like Mr. Beauchamp wanted to bring in water from GDPUD and that the neighborhood "rejected" it as it didn't want it. That is totally not true! Pilot Hill Estates was going to enter a cost sharing with Mr. Beauchamp to provide water to both Pilot Hill Estates, north of Sundance, and Sundance. GDPUD originally quoted that the cost would be \$18,000 per parcel to provide water. By the end of talks with GDPUD it was up to \$60,000 per parcel and Pilot Hill Estates had to withdraw from their joint contract with Mr. Beauchamp due to the cost. Pilot Hill Estates currently has some parcels that have to truck in water. They do want and need GDPUD water desperately So, if the surrounding parcels lose water due to this development where do you think we all could come up with that kind of money to bring in public water. If Chris Beauchamp, the developer, can't afford to bring it in due to the amount of money it would cost, how would we be expected to bring in GDPUD water if we get depleted with this development? If Mr. Beauchamp wants to develop this property so badly he should be required to bring in GDPUD water at whatever the cost - but then that would cut into his profit margin wouldn't it?

Also, regarding Fred Sanford's remarks in the minutes of the November 18 meeting. What kind of remark is it to say we need to "manage our water supply?" If you drive around the neighborhood there are no lawns, orchards

or vineyards. We are all very aware of our water supplies and how precious they are. He also states that 6 of the 56 surrounding wells have been deepened. There are only 32 adjoining lots not 56, his facts were not correct. 6 re-drilled wells is almost 17%. He also failed to say how many properties have multiple wells and obviously he doesn't know how many of us have holding tanks. What restrictions are going to be taken to ensure that the buyers of "Sundance" properties manage their water supplies? Also, regarding his statements about the high levels of manganese and iron. Manganese and iron frequently result in manganese and iron bacteria which is almost impossible to kill even with filtration. The remedy for manganese and iron are various filtering methods all which use a lot of water to flush them out or to find an alternate source for drinking water. One would think this should be a basis for requiring GDPUD water to be brought in also. What is the potential impact of the manganese and iron to the surrounding properties wells if pumping on "Sundance" affects them. I would think the County needs to notify the surrounding area of the potential affects on their water supply.

This is a very rural area with its own exclusive problems with water and fire danger. Please look at this long and hard before a terrible mistake is made and us, the residents, mostly senior, have our property values devalued even further than they already are if there would be water problems. We cannot afford to have you look back and say that a mistake had been made in letting this subdivision be approved.

Mr. Beauchamp's statements at the Planning Commission saying he revised the project along the way after listening to residents concerns and input and tried to do the right thing. Everything, except the gate, has disappeared from each revision he has made. Water has been the big concern from the beginning and that is why he was going to put in GDPUD water. Now he says its too expensive. The trail has been a concern and now he and his team have argued against it.

Please read all the documentation in the package that you have to see what the feelings of the neighborhood are. It is very important that you do to see that it is not favored by many, actually only 1, who happens to live 6 miles down the road and happens to be Mr. Beauchamp's real estate representative. By the way, this same person is saying to people in town that approval by the Board of Supervisors is a done deal and they already have

the votes by the Board of Supervisors for acceptance of this re-zone. This is very disheartening to hear before there is even a meeting. I hope this is not true and you will be fair and read all the documentation that has been presented in the package you all have.

I am sure you would not want this adjacent to any of your properties if you were on wells with the big questions regarding water and now the quality of that water. Please be considerate of those of us who are trying our best to live with what we have and manage our limited water supplies wisely within our financial means to provide that water.

The 29 parcels are expected to generate 2.9 people per parcel. If there are granny residences there is a potential of 150 plus residents who will use water. Please leave it be and deny the re-zone. It is just not good for the survival of the neighborhood which has a population of 415 residences.

Thank you for your time

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marlane Gregoire".

Marlane and Mario Gregoire
4800 Pilot Creek Lane
Pilot Hill, California, 95664
530 823 1640